

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXII, 1.

WHOLE NO. 125.

I.—VAHLEN'S ENNIUS.¹

On September 27 last Johannes Vahlen celebrated his eightieth birthday. In Germany a committee of his "Freunde, Schüler und Verehrer" had been formed to do him honor, and had invited the lovers of the Classics everywhere to contribute to a fund to aid in this purpose.

I had long planned to discuss at least a part of the second edition of Vahlen's Ennius, but divers things had postponed the realization of the project. I hope that the timeliness of the present examination, if I may intrude a word borrowed from journalism within the precincts of classical scholarship, will offset the long gap between the appearance of the book and the present review. Besides, most of the topics treated in this paper are of perennial interest to the serious student of things Roman.²

In 1854 Vahlen, then twenty-four years old, issued a collection of the fragments of Ennius; in 1903, *aetate provectus*, he set forth the ripe results of nearly half a century of further study of the same author. It goes without saying that the new edition does not merely expand the old: it is essentially a different book.³

¹ Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae. Iteratis curis recensuit Iohannes Vahlen. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner (1903). Pp. ccxxiv + 306. 16 marks.

² I know of no searching review of the book in English or German. Skutsch's article on Ennius in Pauly-Wissowa 5, 2589-2628 has Vahlen's book ever in mind; the present paper, however, does not cross that article at many points, and even in those is wholly independent thereof.

³ A most excellent way of realizing how far apart the two editions are is to compare the Index Sermonis of the new with the Index Verborum of the old; one sees thus how widely Vahlen's later groupings of the fragments differ at times from his earlier combinations. The changes in his views concerning the groupings involved great changes in the Prolegomena of the later book.

In 1854 Vahlen could write justly enough in his *Praefatio* that there was then "*vix ulla editio Ennii quae desiderio paullo severiori satis facere possit*". Only thrice before that year had scholars attempted to edit all the Ennian fragments together. In 1564 the Stephani had brought out a collection of fragments of Ennius, Pacuvius, Accius, etc., etc. In 1590 Hieronymus Columna published the fragments of Ennius by themselves. The work showed industry, knowledge of Ennius's language, and skill in the interpretation of individual lines. But inevitably, in the absence of the proper subsidia (see below), the text was often defective. Finally, Columna made no attempt to combine the fragments into coherent groups of verses, a grievous shortcoming, to Vahlen's mind. In 1707 Hessel brought out a *Variorum* revision and amplification of Columna's edition. Of these works, as of the labors of various scholars on *parts* of Ennius, Vahlen wrote in the original book, pages v-vii; he speaks of them at greater length in the later work, cxxxi-cxxxv. Especially interesting in the latter account is what is said (cxxxiv) of the stimulus given to Ennian studies by Ritschl; surely pardonable to a senex saepissime a viris laudandis laudatus is the reproduction of the praise heaped by the Senate of the University of Bonn on Vahlen's studies in the *Annales of Ennius* (1852) presented in competition for a prize which, at Ritschl's suggestion, the University had offered for work in Ennius. In 1852 came, also, Ribbeck's *Fragmenta Tragicorum Romanorum*.

Such was the material bearing directly on Ennius, meager enough, certainly, available to Vahlen in 1854. He was further handicapped by the lack of suitable editions of a host of authors with whom his Ennian studies forced him to deal. Since 1854 Vahlen himself has repeatedly written on the fragments of Ennius (see the list on page cxxxvi). In 1884 L. Müller published his *Einleitung in das Studium der römischen Poesie*; in 1885 he brought out his *Q. Ennii Carminum Reliquiae*. Of these works Vahlen has no high opinion, an estimate with which, so far as the treatment of the text is concerned, I have some sympathy; in other respects Vahlen, I think, undervalues Müller's work. In 1897 Ribbeck's book reached a third edition. As the result of these and many other works there was an ever increasing mass of material bearing directly on Ennius; of all this notice is taken, so far as one man could have taken it in one book, in the work before us.

Again, in 1854, as already said, Vahlen had not at his command trustworthy printed editions of books indispensable to the critical student of Ennius.¹ Of great importance, then, for his later work were the labors, after 1854, of divers scholars on the *Grammatici Latini*, Festus, Gellius, Macrobius, Nonius, Servius, etc., aye on the text of Cicero himself.² In 1854 Vahlen carried a heavy burden well-nigh alone; in his advancing years he might have felt that the very subsidia which from one point of view rendered his continuing labors on Ennius easier and his results surer were, by their very multiplicity and complexity, too huge a task for any single man. Yet he persevered and gave us such a presentation of Ennius's life and works, of the part he has played in the intellectual consciousness of the race from his own day to modern times, of the labors of a host of scholars on this striking personality as only one possessed of splendid powers of body and mind alike, of unflagging devotion, of dauntless courage in a huge task could have produced.

Here, surely, is matter to stir the pulse. Again, the reading of Vahlen's account of studies in Ennius by himself and other scholars, and of the subsidia of the later book gives one a very real and fascinating history of three score important years in classical scholarship. It is hard to realize to-day how little in some respects the scholars of sixty years ago had at command; Vahlen's narrative brings this home with striking force; it makes us realize, also, how prolific of vital work the last six or seven decades have been.

Finally, Vahlen's narrative helps us to appreciate the importance of work on the fragments of early Latin literature. It is easy to think of such work as unimportant, as inevitably dry-as-dust; yet constructive labors in this field demand, beside other powers, fine imaginative insight controlled by sound logical sense. The work of Ribbeck and Vahlen on the fragments of early Latin made clear the imperative need of authoritative editions of a host of authors who had theretofore lain more or less without the ken of classical scholars. Hence the fruit of Vahlen's labors of a lifetime on Ennius are to be sought not merely in the fine volume before us, but also in the great host of studies on those Latin authors whose names recur so frequently in the testimonia of his Ennius.

¹ See the first edition, vii ff., the later, cxxxvii.

² See the later edition, cxxxviii-cxliii.

Space does not permit me to compare, or rather to contrast, the two editions throughout. To what I have said on this point (page 1) I may add a detail or two. The 332 pages of the first edition have been expanded into 530 larger pages in the second; xciv pages of *Prolegomena* have become ccxxiv; the 238 pages devoted to text and notes, the *Index Verborum*, and two short special *Indexes* have been enlarged to 306 pages of similar matter. The *Prolegomena* of the original book consisted almost wholly of *Quaestiones Ennianae*, in eight chapters, dealing with the contents of the various books and justifying the assignment of fragments to certain places. In the new book the title *Quaestiones Ennianae* is dropped, but the same general matters are treated in Part II of the *Prolegomena*, called *De Libris Ennianis*; a new section entitled *Historia Ennii* is prefixed to this (for its contents see below, pages 5-14). The old book showed the Latin text of the fragments, *testimonia* and notes on the same page; the new book retains this arrangement.

A more detailed statement of the contents of the new edition is as follows: (1) a *Praefatio*, pages iii-ccxxiv; (2) the text of the *Annales*, with full citations of the ancient passages in which the fragments have been preserved, and brief notes, 1-117; (3) the text, etc., of the *Scenica*, 118-203; (4) the text, etc., of the *Saturae*, 204-211; (5) the text, etc., of *Varia* (Scipio, *Epigrammata*, *Sota*, *Protrepticus*, *Hedyphagetica*, *Epicharmus*, *Euhe-merus*), 212-229; (6) text, etc., of *Incerta*, 230-239; (7) *Versus falsi ex Pauli Merulae fontibus ducti*, 240-242; (8) *Index Testium*, 243-256; (9) *Index Sermonis*, 257-299; (10) *Addenda et Corrigenda*, 300-306. There is, however, no *Index Rerum*, a lack to be regretted in view of the wide array of topics covered by the *Praefatio*.¹

The massive *Praefatio* falls into two parts. In one the author

¹ Cross-references, too, are none too plentiful. To be sure the titles at the tops of the pages of the *Praefatio* aid the reader in finding topics, but often cross-references would greatly help the busy student, e. g., on iv to cxcvi-cxcvii; on xii, bottom, to lvi; on xiii (to explain "*suo loco exponam*"); on xvi (to explain "*vidimus victoriam . . . secutum*" and "*plane ut Naevium Cicero testatur*"); on xxi, first line; on xxvii (to explain "*Sed de ea re . . . agetur*"); xxvii (to explain the first full paragraph, end, a reference to page 43 might well be added); so on page 43 a reference back to xxvii would be useful. On lxxxvi we need, surely, a reference to the masterly discussion of Gellius 2. 29 on ccxi ff. I miss the helping references in these and other places all the more because this sort of aid is often given.

aims to give a complete "historiam Ennii ab ipsius initiis usque ad hunc librum editum" (iii); in the other he deals with Ennius's writings. The earlier part occupies pages iii-cxlv and contains, aside from a brief discussion of Ennius's life (iii-xix), an examination or at least a reference to nearly everything worth mentioning that was said about Ennius down to the time of Isidorus. There is also a brief indication of comment on him in the Middle Ages and later. A good bibliography of Ennius could be constructed from these pages. If the book contained nothing but this, its author would have deserved supremely well of Latin literature; it is of immense value, in these crowded days, to have a piece of work done so well and accurately that no one will need to do it again.

Though Vahlen is professedly concerned only with Ennius, there is an array of important observations about many other ancient writers whom he considers in his study of the numerous sources of our knowledge of Ennius. With some, perhaps many, of these observations other scholars will not be in full sympathy, but they will none the less learn much, not only in the domain of fact and inference, but, more important still, in the sphere of method.

Let us analyze now in detail the *Historia Ennii* (iii ff.). At once, after *testimonia de nominibus Ennii* have been cited, we come upon most interesting matter. That Ennius talked of himself in his *Saturae* one fragment at least makes plain. This, cited twice by Nonius from Ennius, *Saturae* III, is thus given by Vahlen on page 205:¹

Enni poeta salve, qui mortalibus
versus propinas flammeos medullitus.

Whether, as Vahlen thinks, some one is (apostrophizing or) addressing the poet, or, as I would suggest as also possible, the poet is apostrophizing himself, we have the poet's personality injected into the *Saturae*.

If the words *numquam poëtor nisi <si> podager* (*Sat.* 64²), cited by Priscianus merely as from Ennius, are rightly assigned by Vahlen and Müller (73) to the *Saturae*, we have the same phenomenon a second time. On this basis our author writes

¹ So also Müller gives it, *Q. Enni Carminum Reliquiae*, 74 (cited hereafter merely as Müller). Merrill, *Fragments of Roman Satire*, p. 7, prints above this fragment the following words: "A conversation opens between the poet and a reader".

² I cite Ennius normally by Vahlen's titles and verse-numbering.

(iii): "probabile est eum plura de vita sua ac moribus perstrinxisse". Parallel is the famous epitaph said to have been written by Ennius in his old age for his own bust:

Aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam, etc.¹

Next Vahlen cites Gellius's statement (17. 21. 43) that Varro in primo de poetis libro gave the year of Ennius's birth, with the further memorandum that eum (= Ennium), cum septimum et sexagesimum annum haberet, duodecimum Annalem scripsisse idque ipsum Ennium in eodem libro dicere. He thinks that Varro undoubtedly noted what Ennius had said concerning himself in his writings, because (1) Varro was to later writers their chief authority concerning Ennius, (2), according to Gellius, Varro cited concerning Naevius also what Naevius had said about himself.

Now, in 1886, in his Ueber die Annalen des Ennius, 10 ff., Vahlen had held that Annales 12 was largely autobiographical in character and had in consequence assigned to that book, without warranty from ancient testimonia, various extant fragments bearing on Ennius's life and personality. The argument for this procedure is summed up on pages cxcvi-cxcvii of our Praefatio, as follows.

In 6. 1. 23 Macrobius cites the famous

unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem

from Ennius Annales 12 (says Vahlen).² If I understand Vahlen rightly, he lays much stress here on *nobis* as proving that again in Book 12 Ennius was speaking of himself. But two remarks at least are pertinent. First, there is no sure proof that this passage belongs to 12 at all; see below, footnote 2. Secondly, how precarious Vahlen's reasoning is may be seen by considering Vergil's

¹ Vahlen has no doubt, here or on xvii, that Ennius wrote this epitaph. But L. Müller, Philologus 43. 104, refuses to believe that Ennius wrote these verses. In his edition of the fragments (page 153, under testimonium xlvii) he assigns them to Octavius Lampadio or Q. Vargunteius; see further his note on this passage on pages 247-248. Schanz³, too, is sceptical: see viii. 1. 1, page 122 (s. v. Epigramme), and page 112 (under i). Dougan, on Cicero Tusc. 1. 34, is disinclined to interpret *senis* as denoting actual old age.

² Eyssenhardt (Teubner text, 1868), gives this as from Book 12, after P. Vahlen, page 66, says the Salisb. MS gives vii, not xii. Müller, 36, had put this passage in Book 8.

use of this very passage. In Aeneid 6. 845-846 he makes Anchises say

tu Maximus ille es
unus qui nobis cunctando restituit rem.

Suppose we had of Vergil only fragments: how wide of the mark we should be should we infer that in Aeneid 6 Vergil had written definitely of himself! The *nobis* of the Ennian fragment has no compelling suggestion of the sort Vahlen found in it, admitting that it does indeed belong to Annales 12.

If, then, we would keep our feet on the ground, we have in Gellius alone, if anywhere, categorical proof that Ennius introduced biographical material in Annales 12; Vahlen's 'Combination' is no more successful than such Combinationen are wont to be.¹

Having concluded, however, that in Annales 12 Ennius had written of Fabius and of himself, Vahlen constructs (cxcvii) a theory of the contents of that book which shall explain the incorporation therein of these two themes; he holds that the book was a terminal book, closing one edition of the Annales.² In such a book, indeed, Ennius might have talked at will of himself and of his times, ranging widely over as many years and naming as many heroes as he saw fit.

On the basis of this argument, precarious enough, surely, Vahlen puts in Book 12, beside other things, the following: (1) a verse praising M'. Curius; (2) the famous words in which Ennius compares himself in his old age to a retired race horse;³

¹ Skutsch, 2608, I find, had anticipated my arguments, in part only, however. I find, too, that he had anticipated my own belief that the reading xii in Gellius 17. 21. 43 cannot possibly be right (numerals are notoriously liable to error in our MSS).

² Müller, Quintus Ennius, 128 ff., argued that there were four editions of the Annales, one of six books, one of fifteen, one of sixteen, one of eighteen. Teuffel-Schwabe (I cite Warr's translation, 1891), § 101. 3, had a theory of successive editions ("in series of six respectively of three books [?]", a sentence which is gibberish as it stands: I take it to be meant for "in six series of three books each"), which made 12 a terminal book. Schanz³, VIII. 1. 1, § 117, discusses "Die successive Entstehung der Annalen"; he, too, makes 12 a terminal book, apparently led to do so by Vahlen's arguments. Skutsch 2607, 2610, holds different and safer views.

³ See Cicero Cato Maior 14:

Sicut fortis ecus, spatio qui saepe supremo
vicit Olympia, nunc senio confectus quiescit.

I have long felt that *quiesco* would be a better reading, better by far; see the

(3) another verse of Ennius about himself,

Nos sumus Romani qui fuimus ante Rudini,

which he had formerly set in Book 18. But none of these passages is assigned by any *ancient* authority to a specific book. In so far as Book 12 contained talk by Ennius about himself, continues Vahlen, it was the prototype of Horace Epp. 1. 20. 19 cum tibi sol tepidus, etc.

All this is wonderfully ingenious, especially the comparison of Book 12 and Horace Epistle 1. 20 (I may add that, were it possible to prove the justice of this comparison, we should have Horace turning in the epilogue of his first book of Epistles to Ennius as his exemplar in expressing his sense of his own achievements exactly as he had done in the epilogue to Carmina I-III). But Vahlen has not demonstrated the truth of his comparison; indeed, in the present state of our knowledge, such proof is impossible.¹

Let us consider the matter further. If we are to find support, with Vahlen and Bailey, for Vahlen's view of Annales 12 in the definite "assignation" (Bailey) of certain fragments to that book (I have already denied that such "assignation" is ancient), what are we to say of the very definite ascription by Gellius 12. 4. 1 ff. to Book VII of the famous passage in which Ennius describes a *quidam amicus Servili*, with the further positive assertion (§ 5) that L. Aelium Stilonem dicere solitum ferunt Q. Ennium de semet ipso haec scripsisse picturamque istam morum et ingenii ipsius Q. Ennii factam esse? We may indeed with Vahlen (p. 43) dismiss Gellius's testimony by saying that it merely shows "quam creduli fuerint aut arguti vel Varronis

context. This emendation must surely have made its way into print somewhere, though I have not seen it mentioned. It had occurred independently, I may add, to my colleague Professor Earle.

¹ Mr. Cyril Bailey, however, in *The Classical Review* 18. 170, is inclined to accept Vahlen's combination. Müller, *Quintus Ennius*, 125, has some sound remarks (unfortunately marred by personalities) on the difficulty of grouping at all the extant verses of the Annales. For some admirable comments on this general subject, with demonstration of the futility of certain efforts of this sort in connection with Greek comedy (the fragments of Cratinus), see pages 32-33 of *Addresses and Essays* by the late Professor Morris Hickey Morgan.

aetate priscorum poetarum interpretes",¹ but such assertion is not proof, and is of a piece with that curious tendency which scholars have long shown to cite Gellius with reverence when he supports their theories and to wave him aside when he is a stumbling block to their combinations. But if Gellius is to be set aside here, then his no more precise or positive statement about Book 12 in 17. 21. 43 must also be discarded and Vahlen's argument about Book 12, so laboriously constructed, is wholly without foundation.

My own view is this. Ennius, a strong and vital personality, a man conscious of his powers and of his mission, given to the expression of his literary self-consciousness, was likely to speak of himself anywhere in his writings, much as two kindred spirits of later times, Lucilius and Horace, more than once spoke of themselves. We have positive evidence, not yet disproved and not to be set aside by any *ipse dixit*, that he did so in two different books of the *Annales*.² Till that evidence is disproved, any attempt to group in a single book any large collection of autobiographical allusions is foredoomed to failure.³

Next Vahlen discusses the year of Ennius's birth (v-vi), the year of his death (vi-vii),⁴ his birthplace (vii-ix). All ancient

¹ Sellar, *Roman Poets of the Republic*, 72-74, Ribbeck, *Römische Dichtung*, I. 38-39, Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 140, find no trouble in accepting Gellius's statement. Müller, 191, *Quintus Ennius*, 68-70, would not definitely commit himself. Schanz³, VIII. I. 1, § 36, 2, is sceptical.

² Schanz, page 110 (s. v. *Biographisches*), speaks similarly, though with much less detail.

³ Such an attempt is mistaken, I think, in another way; it involves the assumption, by implication at least, that each book was an artistic whole, from which matter not strictly germane to the theme immediately in hand was excluded. We do not by any means know that such an assumption is well-founded.

⁴ Vahlen makes no comment here or elsewhere (e. g., on page 210) on the cause of Ennius's death. Jerome says he died *articulari morbo*. Priscianus cites a verse from Ennius himself (Vahlen, *Sat.* 64) which some regard as bearing on this matter: *Numquam poetor nisi <si> podager*. By this verse many scholars have been reminded of Horace *Epp.* I. 19. 7:

Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma
prosiliuit dicenda.

Now to me nothing can be clearer than that the Horatian passage as a whole (1-18) is not to be taken too seriously. Schanz, however (p. 110), treats it with desperate seriousness. He regards the famous passage from the *Annales* preserved by Gellius 12. 4 (see above, page 8) as indeed a "Charakterbild"

testimony, right and wrong both, is considered. The implications of the last-named theme, however, are not followed up. Of what nationality was Ennius? What of the bearing of the Greek character of Apulia (Messapia) on Ennius's career? what of the *tria corda* matter, so lightly disposed of on page iv? in what order did Ennius master the three languages he knew and what is the significance of that order? perhaps no positive answer to these questions can be given, but they should at least be asked.¹

Vahlen would like to trace to Ennius himself the story given by Nepos, Cato 1. 4, that Cato as quaestor brought Ennius to Rome from Sardinia; Ennius, he thinks, might have mentioned the fact at the end of *Annales* 12 (as in Epp. 1. 20 Horace men-

of Ennius, drawn, however, by Aelius Stilo, not by Ennius himself, as Gellius avers. He then proceeds; "Nur ein Zug ist vergessen, den uns Horaz aufbewahrt hat, dass nämlich Ennius den Becher liebte und denselben gern leerte, ehe er zur Arbeit schritt. Ennius starb im Jahre 169 am Podagra". Müller, too (Quintus Ennius, 67), takes Horace literally and traces Ennius's gout to his love of strong drink. So, too, Skutsch, 2592, who suggests that Horace drew his information about Ennius in this connection from Ennius's own *Saturae*. So again Tyrrell, *Anthology of Latin Poetry*, p. 206 (note on xiv, 7); he is similarly over-sober in his *Latin Poetry*, 188, 195. Sellar, *Roman Poets of the Republic*, 72, wrote more wisely of Horace's "humorous exaggeration". So, too, Müller, *Quintus Ennius*, 108, forgetting what he had written on page 67 of the same book, as given already in this note, saw the truth in part, though he mixed absurdity with the truth, in describing Ennius's verse cited above "als eine, natürlich scherzhafte, Entschuldigung, dass der Dichter, auch nachdem er römischer Bürger geworden, doch nicht abstehe Verse zu machen". I note that Ennius, in the verse in question, says nothing himself about drinking. Even in ancient days, we may now believe, gout and high living or much drinking did not necessarily stand in causal sequence. I cannot help wondering that no German scholar has attempted as yet, in the spirit of Leo's efforts to explain away in his *Plautinische Forschungen* the traditional accounts of the lives of Naevius and Plautus as due in part to efforts to gain analogues to traditional accounts of Greek writers, to show that the reference to Ennius's gout by Jerome is based merely on the Horatian passage and this in turn on an importation into Ennius's life of notorious traits of Cratinus, of whom Horace is thinking so much in the whole passage.

¹ For discussions of them see Ribbeck, *Römische Tragödie*, 77; Müller, *Quintus Ennius*, 62; Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 136; Schanz³, pp. 109-110, 111 (under *δ*), and, best of all, Skutsch, 2589-2590. I may cite here a remark of Mr. Bailey concerning the book under review (*The Classical Review* 18. 169): "Little will be found in the way of comment on the style and thought or historical accuracy of Ennius; but almost every possible detail, on which such comment may be based".

tioned his own campaigning). But he admits that this is speculation and that there are difficulties in Nepos's story.

On page x Vahlen takes up the ancient tale that Ennius lived on the Aventine, in poverty, with but one ancilla. The story is found only in Jerome, but from Jerome, says Vahlen, we get back to Suetonius, Nepos, Cicero, Varro, and thence to autobiographical matter by Ennius himself (though for autobiographical matter on this point, whose existence is hinted at rather than asserted, no evidence at all is given, aside from a reiteration of the belief (see above, p. 6) that Varro was familiar with all the autobiographical matter in Ennius). If now, he continues, we recall what Festus says (492. 22 Th.) about the grant of the aedes Minervae as a meeting place for *scribae* and *histriones*, we understand why tradition made Ennius live on the Aventine. Jerome's story Vahlen refers to Ennius's early years in Rome, when he gained his living by teaching.¹ He remembers that Cicero says in Cato Maior 14 that Ennius was poor in his old age, but, following again his more or less eclectic policy with respect to the sources, he is disinclined to accept Cicero's testimony. The tradition about the ancilla he traces to the story in Cicero De Oratore 2. 276 concerning Nasica, Ennius and an ancilla; the story may have been told, he thinks, by Ennius himself "in satura aut nescio quo carmine". Having but one slave (or but few slaves), he says, was a "vulgare indicium paupertatis"; he compares Seneca ad Helviam 12. 4 unum fuisse Homero servum, tres Platoni, nullum Zenoni satis constat, and Terence Haut. 293.²

¹ So Schanz, p. 110; cf. Skutsch, 2590.

² I may add Horace Serm. 1. 3. 11-12 (about Hermogenes Tigellius) and Serm. 1. 6. 116 (about himself). In 1895 Leo, Plautinische Forschungen, 67, anticipated part of Vahlen's present criticism of this story. Schanz, § 36, 7, is not convinced by Leo and Vahlen. I may note that there is nothing whatever in Cicero De Oratore 2. 276 to show that Ennius was then poor; not more than one ancilla could well have figured in such a tale, however many slaves Ennius might have had. The argument from Festus's reference to the aedes Minervae is inconclusive; we might fairly urge that one seeking to live by literature at all would naturally fix his abode in the vicinity of the meeting place of the poets. Schanz, too, § 36, 7, doubts the statement in Cicero Cato Maior 14; I need not say, however, that poverty in old age is not incompatible with happier circumstances in earlier days. Ennius outlived his friend Scipio by many years, as Vahlen notes in another connection. If Ennius was poor at any time during his life at Rome, it was, I think, either in

Next Ennius's friendship with Scipio is considered (xii-xiii). Then Vahlen notes that, though Ennius praises Cato, he cannot have been intimate with the censor (in spite of Cicero Cato Maior 10); they were too much unlike and Cato was the enemy of Ennius's friend Scipio. He thinks, further, that Cato's criticism of Fulvius because he took Ennius with him on his campaign to Aetolia is evidence that Cato was not especially friendly, to say the least, to Ennius. But this inference is not inevitable; it is likely enough that Cato's game was Fulvius rather than Ennius (cf. Cicero Tusc. 1. 2). Cato's criticism of Fulvius, continues Vahlen, proves that Ennius did not go with Fulvius to fight, for to that Cato could not have taken exception. Hence, in using *militarat*, in Brutus 79, of Ennius's activities in Aetolia, Cicero was much less exact than he was in Pro Archia 11 about Archias (xix, note 2).¹ Finally, Vahlen approves Ribbeck's suggestion that Ennius's Ambracia dealt with the capture of the city of that name by Fulvius, though, he admits, nothing in the few fragments of the piece proves this. He does not notice Müller's suggestion (Quintus Ennius, 61; cf. Mommsen, R. G. 1⁸. 801) that Ennius took the praenomen Quintus to please the son of Fulvius, to whom he owed citizenship.

Our author holds (xvi) that Ennius spent all his years at Rome in writing. We can seldom tell, however, in what order he produced his works. The Scipio, it is reasonable to suppose, came shortly after the battle of Zama;² so the Ambracia would have come most fittingly immediately after Fulvius's triumph in 187. According to Varro ap. Gell. 17. 21. 43 Ennius was writing *Annales* 12 in 172.³ From all this Vahlen concluded in 1886

his first days there, before he had won powerful patrons, or in his last days, when those patrons were dead. (Professor Sihler, in his paper on The Collegium Poetarum at Rome, A. J. P. XXVI 4 ff., emphasizes the poverty of poetæ and scribae). From the fact that Ennius got citizenship from the son of Fulvius, one may, perhaps, conclude that Ennius outlived another patron of his middle life, the elder Fulvius. Skutsch, 2590, thinks these stories of Ennius's poverty may well go back to autobiographical passages in Ennius's writings.

¹ Aurelius Victor De Vir. Ill. 52 was much more exact. On the general points involved see Müller, Quintus Ennius, 66; Schanz, p. 110; Skutsch 2591. I may add that at the time of Fulvius's campaign Ennius was fifty years old, and so beyond the normal fighting age.

² Skutsch, 2599, is less precise; he merely says the Scipio must have preceded the *Annales*.

³ But see above, page 7, especially note 1.

that Ennius did not begin his *Annales* till 184, and that he was busy on them till he died (as Naevius wrote his *Bellum Punicum* in his old age: Cicero *Cato Maior* 50). Vahlen adds now that in *Annales* IX Ennius praises the Consul Cethegus in terms which imply that Cethegus belonged to a period earlier by twenty-five years, more or less, than the time of writing. Cethegus was consul in 194. It may perhaps be captious to note that twenty-five years would bring Book 9 down to 169, a period three years later than that so often insisted on by our author for Book 12. In Book 12, continues Vahlen, Ennius confesses that he is old; again, in the first line of his famous epitaph, which contains a direct reference to the *Annales*, he describes himself as *senex*. I fail to see the force of this last point. If we accept the epitaph as by Ennius himself (see above, page 6, note 1), it still need not *per se* prove at all that the *Annales* and the epitaph were contemporaneous. In writing his epitaph in advanced age a man might look back over many years to work done long before.

Before 184, says Vahlen, Ennius devoted himself to play writing, because thus he could most readily have earned a living. Here several things, it seems to me, are ignored. What of the evidence that Ennius was a teacher? When was this teaching done? It is surely not likely to have been done after he became a figure of consequence in the national literature. Further, was there really a good chance of supporting one's self by writing plays?¹ Not many plays, surely, can have been brought out by one man in any one year (the days of the *ludi* were not so numerous in Ennius's time); the stress laid on the sum, small enough in itself, won by Terence through his *Eunuchus* shows that the normal payments to playwrights cannot have been large. Still, as Ribbeck notes in his *Römische Tragödie*, 78, the years following the close of the Second Punic War were very favorable to the drama. We may note also that Livius Andronicus's first play(s) followed the close of the First Punic War, and that the statement commonly made that concentric sets of seats (*gradus*) in the theater date from 146 B. C. rests on no better foundation than the inference that the period of rejoicing over the fall of Corinth and Carthage would naturally have set up conditions equally or even more favorable to the production of plays.

¹ I admit that similar queries may well be put concerning the possibility of supporting one's self by teaching in Ennius's time.

Finally, although Ennius never stopped writing plays (witness his *Thyestes* in his last year), Vahlen thinks he produced most of his dramas before he began to write the *Annales*.

On pages xviii-xix Vahlen rejects the ancient story, found in varying forms in several writers, that the bust of Ennius stood on Scipio's tomb, by the latter's orders. He rejects it on the grounds, first, that the authors who first mention it do not speak categorically (cf. *putatur* in Cicero *Pro Archia* 22, and *dicuntur* in Livy 38. 56. 4), and, secondly, that Ennius died some eighteen years after Scipio.¹ The latter argument is inconclusive. Scipio, not being able to foresee how long Ennius would outlive him, might well enough (why may not the reviewer too indulge in speculation?) have asked that some memorial of his friendship with Ennius be placed on his tomb; it is not too hard to believe that even eighteen years after his death his wish—had he expressed such a wish—still carried weight with his family, a family rather tenacious of memories and customs. However, Vahlen thinks that the whole tale arose merely from the fact that Ennius was a contemporary of Scipio and had praised him; he believes rather, on the basis of a different story in Jerome, that Ennius's body was burned on the Janiculum and that his bones were sent to Rudiae. On these same pages reference is made to the intimacy of Ennius and Caecilius.

Here ends the *Vita Enni*.

Vahlen turns now to consider in great detail the attitude of other writers toward Ennius. How far do other writers cite him? In what way do they cite him? What is the value of their citations? What light do they throw on the esteem in which Ennius was held? How far do they help us to reconstruct his works or to form a conception of their arguments? These and allied questions Vahlen has ever in mind (xix-cxxxi).²

It is probable, he thinks, that Ennius knew neither Livius Andronicus nor Naevius (xix-xx). There is no sure evidence that Livius was alive after 207, the year of his poem in honor of Juno; Naevius lived on after 204, but away from Rome. Years after Naevius's death, when Ennius had got round to describing the First Punic War, he wrote harshly of Naevius, to the wrath of Cicero (*Brutus* 75), but he had then an axe to grind, in that he was seeking to show the vast distance between the rude Satur-

¹ Cf. Skutsch, 2590-2591.

² Cf. Skutsch, 2613 ff.

nians of Livius and Naevius and his own hexameters,¹ at once more ambitious in effort and more polished in fact.

Cicero, l. c., charges that Ennius after all borrowed from Naevius. The fragments show no clear light on this point. We must, however, bear in mind (xx) that both Naevius and Ennius began with Aeneas and that Ennius treated this part of his theme "non parce"; certain things (see Vahlen on Ann. 35-51, in the testimonia) make it likely that, had we both poets com-

¹ I insert here a note I have long had in mind to write. Ribbeck, *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*³, p. 5, gives at the end of his collection of the fragments of Livius Andronicus four verses which Terentianus Maurus cites as from Livius ille vetus Graio cognomine. Of these verses the first and the third are hexameters, the second and the fourth *miuri*. Marius Victorinus supports Terentianus. In his edition of the *Fragmenta* Ribbeck does not seem to doubt this testimony. In his comments on the lines he does indeed say, as his last word, this: "Laevio tribuit Scaliger: cf. mea hist. trag. Rom., p. 34 adn."; but the footnote in question contains no reference to Scaliger. In his *Römische Tragödie*, page 34, text, he discusses our verses in his treatment of Livius Andronicus; here there are notes of scepticism, as follows: "Auch die Ino des Livius Andronicus, wenn es ein solches Stück gab, muss diesen Stoff behandelt haben". In a footnote to the clause I have italicized, Ribbeck holds that we must forever remain uncertain on that point because Laevius too wrote an Ino. To this he adds nothing beyond the statement that the verses under discussion are "in offenbar modernisirter Form". Teuffel (§§ 13. 5; 94. 5) and Cruttwell (p. 38) believed unreservedly that Andronicus wrote these lines.

It has long seemed to me, independently of the attitude of others, that these lines have the appearance of being late productions. It is hard to believe that Livius could have produced verses as smooth as these or indeed that he attempted such a metrical tour de force at all. All the arguments by various scholars to the effect that the acrostic *argumenta* to the plays of Plautus must, on grounds of form alone, be assigned to a relatively late and sophisticated age apply, mutandis mutatis, to our verses.

Now, a poet Laevius flourished about 64 B. C. He is constantly confounded by the ancients "with Livius, Naevius, Lepidus, Laevinus, even with Pacuvius" (Teuffel, § 150. 4; Schanz, VIII. 1. 2, § 91). It is known that this Laevius used a wide variety of meters, among which Teuffel, l. c., names iambic dimeters, trochaics, scazons, anapaests, hexameters, phalaecians, etc. (cf. Schanz, l. c., p. 34). It would appear, also, that he wrote a work called Ino. It seems to me altogether probable that the verses in Ribbeck, cited as from an Ino of Livius, are to be ascribed rather to Laevius. I may add that *odorisequus*, found in the fourth of the verses under discussion, is precisely the sort of compound that Laevius affected (see Gellius 19. 7. 2 ff.; Schanz, p. 37). No marked compounds occur in indisputable fragments of Livius.

I find now that others have lately questioned the Livian authorship of these verses; see Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 125, n. 2.

plete, we should find more evidence of borrowing by the later writer. I may add that everything we know about the methods of work of Latin writers lends credibility to any statement made in ancient times that Ennius borrowed, where opportunity offered, from his predecessor.

Plautus and Ennius lived in Rome contemporaneously for over twenty years. Yet of their relations nothing is known. The Prologue of the *Poenulus* does indeed contain a reference to the Achilles Aristarchi (of Ennius), but that gives no hint of personal relations between the two men, even if this prologue is really Plautine.¹ One thing the allusion does prove; by the time this prologue was written Ennius's fame was secure: the spectators know whose play is meant, though the author is not named. Vahlen believes that he detects certain similarities in language between Plautus and Ennius (xxi, bottom)².

¹On this point Vahlen has no doubts (cf. xxi: "Plautinum enim hunc prologum esse non est quod dubitetur"); Plautine scholars, however, have held on various grounds doubts of its authenticity, at least in part: cf. e. g., Palmer, *Amphitruo*, pp. 127-128 (by implication, in what is said about fixed seats in the theater), Morris on *Captivi* 68, p. 8, and in particular Ritschl, *Parerga* 219-220, 225. I feel sorry to be obliged to record that Vahlen's pronouncements on moot matters outside of problems connected with Ennius are more than once mere obiter dicta, beset by the fatality which so often overwhelms the obiter dicta of the bench. See below, p. 23, n. 2. Still more striking is the way in which in two lines (ccxiv) he disposes of the dramatic Satura; see my comments in *A. J. P.* XXIX 468-469.

²Vahlen adds: "nec dubito quin aliorum diligentia plura inventura sit, sed ne ea quidem est quod alterum sumpsisse ab altero quam utrumque ex communi sermonis usu prompsisse malimus". Certainly the similarities noted by Vahlen himself are, as he admits, without significance.

I hope that an investigation which I have on hand at present, involving a search for References to Painting and Literature in Plautus and Terence, will throw brighter light on this subject. For the present I content myself with asking the reader to compare that most brilliant of all the parodies in Plautus, *Bacchides* 925-978, with Ennius *Scen.* 92 ff.; especially let him put Plautus 933

O Troia, o patria, o Pergamum, o Priame periisti senex

side by side with Ennius 92 ff.:

O pater, o patria, o Priami domus, etc.

My investigation will show clearly, I can see already, that Plautus knew contemporary and earlier tragedy well, and that he girds at it from time to time; he can hardly have left Ennius, the most successful writer of tragedy thus far, out of his ken. See *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 41.

Caecilius and Ennius were intimates (xvii, xviii). Pacuvius, says Vahlen (xxii-xxiii), for many years "*picturam exercuit*"; he was *persenex* when he began to compose tragedies. Having cited the well-known verses,

Pacvi discipulus dicor, porro is fuit Enni,
Ennius Musarum, Pompilius clueor,

Vahlen writes thus (xxiv): "Sed is qui se Pacuvii (*Pacvi*) discipulum dicit, si Pacuvium Ennii discipulum voluit ea mente qua Ennium Musarum, non est profecto quod Pacuvium vivo Ennio et eo docente tragicam artem didicisse statuamus". This, I confess, I do not understand. He notes further that in later days Pacuvius was believed to have outshone Ennius, "*nec solum in tragoedia*". He proceeds immediately to cite allusions to Pacuvius's *Saturae*; the juxtaposition seems to imply that he would have us feel that Pacuvius surpassed Ennius in this field too. But the references cited by him surely give no color at all to such a view. Nor is the view favored by the fact that Pacuvius's *Saturae* have completely disappeared.

Of writers who were not Ennius's contemporaries Terence is the first to mention him; in *Andria* 18 ff. he names Ennius as one of those whose use of *contaminatio* justified his own practice in that regard. The circumstances under which Terence wrote this passage preclude the possibility of doubting his testimony. Yet, Vahlen maintains (xxiv), in the extant fragments of Ennius there is no hint of *contaminatio*. The claim made by some that there are traces of contamination in the *Iphigenia* Vahlen refuses to admit.¹

It is seldom that Terence seems to have Ennius in mind, says

¹I note that, in spite of Terence's own admission that he contaminated, modern scholarship has failed to add evidences of this process from his *complete* plays. This, let me remark in passing, is the finest possible tribute to his consummate art. The absence of any real evidence of contamination in Ennius's *fragments* was to be expected, in view of the nature of the fragments, the mode of their preservation, and the fact that they were cited by ancient writers commonly to prove isolated points, not to throw general light on Ennius's writings in the large. The whole matter may serve once again to warn us how hesitant we should be to make general declarations concerning a writer on the basis of fragments only of his work. See above, p. 8, n. 1.

Vahlen. He asks us, however, to compare Syrus's words in *Adelphoe* 386 ff.

istuc est sapere, non quod ante pedes modost
videre, sed etiam illa quae futura sunt
prospicere,

with a verse in the *Iphigenia* (Scen. 244):

Quod est ante pedes nemo spectat, caeli scrutantur plagas.

He notes that Donatus ad loc. declares that hoc sumpsit poeta de illo in physicum pervulgato ancillae dicto, and then cites the Ennius verse. I would suggest that perhaps rather both authors are drawing on a proverbial expression, similar in spirit to the parable of the mote and the beam. Again, in *Eunuchus* 590

At quem deum! qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit!

Donatus saw *parodia* de Ennio; in Scen. 380 we have

qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit.

In his Praefatio xxiv Vahlen thinks that "Terentius . . . hunc versum ita affert . . . ut se uti alieno versu indicare videatur" (something I myself quite fail to see); in the testimonium to Ennius's verse, however (p. 192), he says "Ennii versus fueritne talis qualem Terentius posuit dubium reddit Donati adnotatio". But it was natural for poet after poet to refer to Jupiter's thunder, and it would have been difficult to make the references much unlike. Finally, says our author, Phormio 339-340 is surely an imitation of the six verses which he has included, though very doubtfully, in the fragments of the *Saturae* (Book 6, vss. 14-19).¹

Vahlen writes next of Vargunteius's efforts to make Ennius's *Annales* better known by reading them publicly *certis diebus*, and then quotes (xxvi) Fronto's statement that L. Caelius Antipater <Ennium> aemulatus est. From this he infers (1) that Caelius read Ennius diligently, and (2) that since Cicero declares (*De Legg.* 1. 6, *De Orat.* 2. 54) that Caelius paid some heed to

¹ The investigation referred to above, on page 16, n. 2, has already shown clearly that Terence offers far less material in that connection than Plautus; we may feel certain that his consummate sense of art prevented him from introducing matter which might seem extraneous. I may refer to my observations on the care with which Terence confines his geographical references to strictly Greek geography, made in my paper on *Travel in Ancient Times* as seen in Plautus and Terence, *Classical Philology*, 2. 5, n. 2.

style, "in ea re ad Ennii exemplum se composuisse". Yet, he argues, we must not read too much into Fronto's utterance; he is thinking primarily of the right choice of words.¹ Hence Vahlen differs from those who, because Livy used Caelius as one of his authorities for the Hannibalic War, whenever they see in Livy "colore quodam poetico distincta", ascribe these things at once to Caelius, as imitator Ennii, and feel that in this way they are increasing our store of fragments of Ennius.²

I must pass over Vahlen's discussion of the relation of Aelius Stilo (xxvii), Lucilius (xxvii ff.), and Lucretius (xxx) to Ennius. We turn rather to two men, contemporaries, who have done most to preserve Ennius's verses, Varro and Cicero.

Varro couples Ennius and Homer more than once; he refers to Ennius even in his *De Re Rustica*. In his *Saturae* he cited him, probably, not seldom (xxxi), a significant fact, because Varro wished his *Saturae* to be generally used; his citation of Ennius's verses without indication of authorship proves how well and widely Ennius's writings were known. A richer source, however, of verses of Ennius is the *De Lingua Latina*, especially Books 5-7, which deal with *usus sermonis*; even more fruitful is Book 8, which sets forth "propria poetarum in significandis locis ac temporibus consuetudo". But helpful as Varro is, he has his defects; he does not cite exactly with the name of the work and the number of the book whence the fragment comes; he writes rather as "homo doctus . . . doctis hominibus ex immensa copia eruditionis semper affluentis" (xxxii). Again, at times at least he is not verbally accurate (we can check some of his citations by appeal to works surviving intact). So, then, he never names the *Annales*; of course he never ascribes a fragment to a specific book of the *Annales*. The tragedies he does at times name (xxxi, xxxiv); sometimes he cites, not a play, but the name of a character in a play (xxxv). All this renders it extremely difficult to assign to their proper places the fragments of Ennius preserved for us by Varro.

Cicero (xxxix ff.) "singulari favore prosecutus est Ennium, cuius memoria dici non potest quantum debeat Ciceroni". To

¹ In a footnote Vahlen declares that he fails to find resemblances between the fragments of Caelius and those of Ennius. Cf. Skutsch, 2618.

² Vahlen declares he will discuss this point later when he comes to Livy. I shall merely say, therefore, here that I agree heartily with his position. See below, page 24.

him (and, I may add, to Gellius) we owe the long continuous passages. Again, Cicero's quotations deal mainly with matters and thoughts, not with syllables and forms; thus he indicates the connection, the context of the passages he cites, helping us to get an idea often of the argument, and, in the case of plays, even of the action.

Now, says Vahlen, Cicero was an orator heard by many, a writer who desired to be read by many. Hence his citations of Ennius prove that Ennius was a popular poet (his tragedies, we may remember, were still often seen in Cicero's time: xlix); he was reminding "*homines liberaliter instituti*" of facts and thoughts perfectly familiar to them from their own reading and from their own witnessing of plays.

Turning now to details Vahlen notes that there are not many citations from Ennius in Cicero's Orations. At once I pause to ask how this fact fits in with Vahlen's contention, just set forth, that Ennius was a well-known, much read and popular poet. There are indeed, as Vahlen reminds us, notable references to Ennius in the *Pro Archia* (xxxix-xl). But the *Pro Archia*, I would ask the reader to remember, was unique; it was addressed, not to the many, but to a small group of iudices, picked men, with a presiding officer whose culture is dwelt upon; yet even to these men Cicero is apologetic throughout with respect to culture and pure literature. We may recall with profit the fact that Cicero adopts varying tones about certain subjects, according as he talks to the populace in the open air or to the few in the Senate. In *Pro Murena* 30 he refers to Ennius, without naming him; but here again, I ask the reader to note, he is addressing a jury. Again, here, as elsewhere, Cicero converts to his own uses what Ennius had said, "*ut appareat quantum Cicero ab auditorum intelligentia exspectaret*" (xli). An examination of the *Index Testium* on pages 244 ff. fails to show any citations by Cicero from Ennius in the *Catiline Orations* or in the *Manilian Law*, orations specifically addressed to the people. We may surmise, also, that on the whole some citations from the poets in Orations were added in that revision which, as we know, Cicero gave to his speeches before they were published. It would seem to me, then, that so far as citations from Ennius in the Orations go, they prove clearly that Cicero himself knew Ennius well and that in his opinion the sort of men who served as iudices also knew the poet, but they do not prove that Ennius was known to the many.

Of Cicero's rhetorical writings the *De Oratore*—the most elaborate of them all, I may note—shows many citations from Ennius, especially in Book 3. The plan of the work makes these in general short pieces; Cicero takes for granted his reader's knowledge of the rest (xlii–xliii). Similar are the citations in the *Orator*; there are also here some general judgments of the poet, and a comparison of him with Homer. The *Brutus* gives us important fragmenta Enniana. All this rather confirms, I think, what I said above about the absence of citations from Ennius in the *Orations*; when Cicero is writing elaborately, to the few who have leisure to *read* as often as they will what he has said, his citations are far more numerous than they are when he is talking to the populace which must take in at a single hearing all that the orator says.¹

The philosophical works give us “*immensa copia . . . testimoniorum*” (xlvi ff.). The *Annales* Cicero very seldom names, “*quotquot versus citavit qui non possunt nisi in Annalibus locum habuisse*”. He names Ennius, occasionally the character whom the poet had represented as speaking, sometimes verses alone without name of poet or work, “*tamen non dubius haec recte ab iis quibus vult intelligi*”. “*Poetam appellat, nusquam poema, sed loquitur ut de re nota decerpitis admonendi causa paucis particulis versuum ne inter se quidem connexorum*” (xlvii).²

Cicero's philosophical works, without exception, yield fragments of Ennius, but the *Tusculans* contribute most; in the *Tusculans*, by the way, he justifies, by contemporary Greek usage, the introduction of verses into philosophical discussions. These citations come particularly from the tragedies; for a list of tragedies cited by Cicero see page 1.³ Many verses, plainly tragic, are quoted without assignment to definite plays. But, says Vahlen, it was not necessary for him to name the plays “*quas nemo erat quin de scena cognitاس haberet*”. He often names

¹ Nettleship, *Lectures and Essays*, Second Series, 105, 109, has well pointed out how the fact that Caesar and Cicero both were at bottom orators by training, seeking to convey instantaneously their message to people's ears, accounts for certain characteristics of their style, e. g., the fact that their periods are far less intricate than those of Livy, who wrote for readers.

² The longest surviving fragments of the *Annales* we owe to *De Divinatione* 1; both are cited merely as *apud Ennium*.

³ Holden, in his note on Cicero *De Officiis* 1. 114 (l. 15), had given a good list of tragedies of Ennius cited by Cicero.

rather the character whose words he is quoting. Again, he does not always quote the exact words (I, liii).¹

In Cicero's Epistles there is little of Ennius, though he is once named, "sed quae sunt aperiunt quam familiaris fuerit Ciceroni

¹ Pages xlviii-xlix bring up a matter which has long interested me. Two passages are cited there, one from *De Finibus* I. 4, the other from *Academica* I. 10, in which Cicero expresses somewhat different ideas concerning the way in which Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius rendered their Greek originals. In the former he implies that they wrote *fabellas ad verbum e Graecis expressas*, in the latter he says they *non verba sed vim Graecorum expresserunt poetarum*.

Vahlen does not discuss these passages. I cannot refrain from setting forth my own opinion that a comparison of the fragments of Ennius, at least, with their Greek originals, will show that Cicero's words in the *Academica* are much nearer the truth. The matter is no mere academic question; a man's attitude toward it may affect deeply his view of certain very important questions. For example, Professor M. L. Earle, in an article entitled *Studies in Sophocles's Trachinians* (*Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 33. 21-29), considered at length Cicero's translation in *Tusc.* 2. 20-22 of Sophocles's *Trachinians* 1046-1102. Professor Earle throughout tacitly assumes that Cicero was seeking to translate as literally as possible (as literally as his knowledge of Greek made possible), and so sought to determine the probable Greek original of Cicero's rendering and compared or contrasted the readings thus inferred with the *textus receptus* of Sophocles. This procedure was, to my mind, quite unjustifiable. The theory that Cicero was trying to translate as closely as possible is not the only conceivable explanation of the differences between the Latin version and the Greek original; those differences can be explained perfectly well on another theory, to wit, that Cicero was, in the language of the *Academica*, seeking to express *non verba sed vis Sophoclis*. The latter theory, in itself more natural, is made far more probable when we recall, what Professor Earle does not note at all as a factor in the problem, that Cicero was translating iambic trimeters in one language into iambic senarii in another quite different language. No one would hold Professor Earle's attitude in connection with an English hexameter translation, say, of the *Aeneid*.

I am myself thoroughly convinced that the *Academica* passage gives the truth; in *De Finibus*, I. c., Cicero held a brief, with himself as client, beset by a charge to which he was always extremely sensitive (see Dr. Reid's admirable discussion of Cicero as *Man of Letters* and *Student of Philosophy*, in his larger edition of the *Academica*, pages 1-10).

In the case of Ennius, to apply to our general subject the foregoing remarks, there is clear proof that, though he often enough misunderstood the Greek (but have not far more learned Greek scholars since his day, with far better subsidia at their command, done this?), he often departed deliberately from his originals. I cite at present but one authority—a disinterested one—on this point; see Mackail's remarks in his *Latin Literature*, p. 8, on Ennius's *Iphigenia at Aulis*.

Ennii poesis et quam non ignota iis ad quos scribit. Utitur enim Ennianis ut suae orationi leporis aliquid et facetiarum impertiat, quod placere possit iis quibuscum communicat" (liv). I note once again, however, that Cicero's correspondents were, in general, men who stood out from the common throng.

We have come by this time to the Augustan Age (lv ff.). In the last half century B. C. Ennius was less highly esteemed than he had been by Cicero. Still, Augustus, in a letter to Tiberius (Suet. Tib. 21; see Vahlen lvi), applied to Tiberius, in slightly modified form, a famous verse of Ennius, writing:

Unus homo nobis vigilando restituit rem.

Vergil¹ was deeply indebted to Ennius, if Macrobius and Servius are to be believed (see below, pages 32-34). Horace's pronouncements on Ennius vary; in at least one place, however (Serm. i. 4. 60 ff.), he speaks of him with marked respect.² Occasionally, says Vahlen, we can see traces of Ennius's verses in Horace. Still, of infelicities in Ennius Horace speaks in Serm. i. 10. 57 ff³. In Horace's time the battle between the advocates of the older and those of the newer literature was on⁴; the extravagant praise bestowed by some on Ennius Horace vigorously opposed in Epp. 2. i. 50 ff. But this very passage and *Ars Poetica* 258 testify to Ennius's vogue; the latter also proves that Ennius's tragedies were still seen on the stage.

On page lx there is a brief treatment of Ovid's attitude toward Ennius; though he criticises the older poet as lacking in art, he none the less testifies to his vogue. Then, in a very interesting

¹Skutsch, 2616, emphasizing the extent to which Vergil imitated Ennius, holds that precisely this fact, in view of the success of the *Aeneid*, "am meisten dazu beigetragen hat, dass die Nachfolgenden <i. e., the literary artists of the later time> mehr und mehr Geschmack und Interesse an E. verloren".

²Vahlen cites also Carm. 4. 8. 17-20, as evidence of Horace's respect for Ennius. Neither here nor on page xii, where he had already cited these verses, does he give any hint that he questions the authenticity of this Ode in whole or in part. See above, p. 16, n. 1.

³Animadversion upon Ennius's infelicities and reproduction of some of his phrases or verses are of course not incompatible. If we need proof on this point, we may recall that, spite of his words in Serm. i. 10. 16-19, Horace did reproduce bits of Catullus.

⁴See also my paper on Archaism in Aulus Gellius, in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler*, 135.

part of the Praefatio (lxi ff.), Vahlen considers the relation of Livy to Ennius. Interwoven with this discussion is a further treatment of Ovid's relation to our poet. These themes Vahlen interlaces "ob necessitatem quam ambo (i. e. Livy and Ovid) cum Ennio habuisse creduntur".

Livy¹ mentions Ennius but twice. In 38. 56. 4 he refers to the statue in Scipionum monumento said to have been that of the poet. In 30. 26. 9, in relating the death of Q. Fabius Maximus, he says of him, nihil certius est quam unum hominem nobis cunctando rem restituisse, sicut Ennius ait. As Vahlen notes, the well-known verse Livy need not have derived directly from the Annales, particularly since "eum solutis numeris affert".

Verses of Ennius Livy does at times adapt to his own purposes. But Vahlen refuses to follow those who see (as Hug saw) whole verses transplanted bodily by Livy into his own work. Livy knew too well, says Vahlen, the dicta of the rhetoricians—e. g. Cicero—against the presence of complete verses in prose writings.²

Nor will Vahlen accept Ehwald's view that "vestigia quaedam non solum orationis sed etiam metrorum Ennianorum" are to be discovered in Livy. Ehwald compared certain verses in Ovid de excessu Romuli with utterances of Livy on the same theme, found them, he maintained, alike, and concluded that the likeness meant that both authors had imitated Ennius (lxii).

By another path scholars have sought to find vestigia Enniana in Livy, ascribing to Ennius's influence "quae numerosi quid habent aut colore poetico distincta sunt". Caelius Antipater, according to Cicero, had paid some heed to style (see above, page 18); hence these critics have held that passages in Livy that are rhythmical or poetic in coloring come ultimately from Ennius, not directly, but through Caelius. Indeed, cries Vahlen, to hear these critics talk, one would almost fancy that Caelius had written of the Hannibalic War in verse! (lxiii).

Now, if Livy did not use Caelius as his sole authority—and we know he did not—why should we ascribe to Caelius alone "quaecumque numerosi quid habere viderentur in his libris Livianis"?

¹See Skutsch, 2618.

²Yet there are verses and parts of verses in Livy, verses consciously made or unconsciously allowed by him, a thing worse than an intentional quotation or unconscious reminiscence.

All this leads Vahlen naturally to consider (lxiv) certain views put forth by Wölfflin (Rh. Mus. 50 (1895). 152) and the latter's pupil, Mr. S. G. Stacey (Archiv 10. 17 ff.). Wölfflin, he says, "non sanae cupiditati versus Ennii ex Livio recuperandi sua auctoritate novum fervorem addidit"; struck by the non-prose word-order in Livy 9. 41. 18 et sicubi est certamen, scutis magis quam gladiis geritur res, and remembering that Ennius had written

pellitur e medio sapientia, vi geritur res,

he concluded that Livy had derived a fragment of a hexameter (*geritur res*) from Ennius.

To this Vahlen objects as follows: (1) if we pronounce rightly (*gêritur rés*), we have no dactylic swing at all; (2) there are many parallels in Livy to the word-order which caught Wölfflin's eye; indeed, the postposition of *res* is a Livian fad.

Wölfflin's view was adopted and expanded by his pupil, Mr. Stacey (lxiv). In his doctoral dissertation Mr. Stacey laid stress on the "Livianae orationis poeticus color"; finding a certain mode of expression both in Livy and in the fragments of Ennius, or in Livy and in some of the other poets, especially Vergil (imitator Ennianus), he held that these modes of expression were originated by Ennius. Such argument, says Vahlen, is fallacious. We need first of all, he continues, to compare Livy with Livy himself, with the utmost care and acumen; only thus shall we be able to determine just what is Livian, just what is foreign to his style (the brief discussion above of the erroneous stress laid by Wölfflin on the occurrence of *geritur res* as a terminal phrase in Livy will show what Vahlen means here). Again, to infer from two known facts a third unknown fact or idea is a procedure which is "seminator . . . multorum inanum et incredibilium": why, pray, does it follow that, merely because Livy and Vergil have a given expression, both derived it from Ennius?¹

¹ I fear that Vahlen is here not quite just. Wölfflin and Stacey remind us carefully of Vergil's indebtedness to Ennius; this makes their line of study far less palpably absurd than Vahlen represents it to be. It happens that the year which saw the publication of the book under review witnessed the issuance by the same publishers of Norden's monumental edition of Aeneid VI. Norden was strongly disposed to accept the views of Wölfflin and Stacey; he repeatedly mentions Mr. Stacey's paper with commendation. In my review of Norden's book (A. J. P. XXVII 71-83) I discussed this whole matter (pages 76-77). I was at that time not familiar with Vahlen's views,

Verrius Flaccus's relation to Ennius is now considered (lxv ff.). He "non exiguam partem Ennii carminibus tribuit". To dogmatize here is difficult, since we have to deal now, not with Verrius's work itself, but with epitomes of it made by two men living in widely sundered periods. Yet Vahlen is convinced that Verrius read and excerpted Ennius for himself. To Festus go back many verses of the *Annales* and of some tragedies (lxvi). The *Annales* are cited by books, and always—save once—in the order of the books¹ (cf. e. g., 172. 1 Ennius libro VI . . . et libro XVI; 194. 14 Ennius in libro II . . . ; item in libro V . . . ; item in libro VIII. The exception is 220. 25 Ennius libro XVI . . . et in libro VIII).² We may assume, says Vahlen, that Verrius himself had cited the *Annales* in this way.

Further, in Festus the tragedies are cited by their *names*, after the *Annales*, but in no settled order. Only twelve or thirteen in all are cited; the total number of quotations is not large. Again, whether he quotes from the *Annales* or from the plays, Festus usually cites "singulos versus . . . , plenos illos quidem numeris, sed sententia saepe non absoluta" (lxvii); fifty times, more or less, he quotes thus from the *Annales*. Often what he quotes is but a dependent clause. His method of quotation from the tragedies is the same (lxix). Yet, complains Vahlen, rightly, such passages have been repeatedly 'emended', with consequent misinterpretation.³

as outlined above. But a careful consideration of the points at issue had left me decidedly sceptical, on grounds differing from those advanced by Vahlen. Skutsch, 2616, however, is much impressed by Norden's efforts to extract fresh bits of Ennius from Vergil (he does not mention Wölfflin or Stacey). But his enthusiasm here is in large degree nullified (though he does not realize this) by a remark made in 2615, to the effect that certain phrases in Catullus 64 cannot be taken as evidence of Ennian influence on Catullus because such phrases "haben jetzt die römische Poesie so durchsetzt, dass der Ennianische Ursprung vergessen ist". These words give pretty clearly the argument in my review of Norden's book referred to in the text above.

¹This agrees, I may note, with Nonius Marcellus's usual method of citation; see my review of Marx's edition of Lucilius, A. J. P. XXIX 478-482, especially 481, and the references there to Lindsay's Nonius Marcellus's Dictionary of Republican Latin.

²It would be easy to suggest that in Festus VIII is an error for XVIII.

³Nonius Marcellus, too, cites in this fashion; see, e. g., Lindsay's edition of Nonius (1903), I. xxxviii-xxxix, and my review of Norden's Aeneid VI in A. J. P. XXVII 77.

Assuming now, as Vahlen does, with good reason, I think, that these modes of citation were copied by Festus from Verrius, we shall see that Verrius's way of citing Ennius was widely different from Cicero's or Varro's; see above, pages 19-23. The later scholar, we see, was far more exact (more modern, if you will, in his exactness) not merely than the litterateur Cicero, but than the doctissimus Romanorum himself.

Paulus Diaconus uses a very different method. He names Ennius often, but nowhere does he give the title of a tragedy or the number of the book from which he is quoting. When he gives verses not found in Festus he often combines with them explanatory glosses (lxxi).

In one passage (Praef. to Book 9. 16) Vitruvius speaks reverently of Ennius. Valerius Maximus, Phaedrus, Velleius show no particular knowledge of the poet (lxxii, lxxiii). By Nero's time Ennius's fame had waned so much that Seneca makes light of him in various places (but then, let us note with Vahlen, he held Cicero in no great esteem), and Persius laughs at him (lxxiii-lxxv). Pliny the Elder gives us some new fragments (lxxvi). Silius Italicus admired Ennius greatly (lxxvi: see 12. 393 ff.); Statius, too, valued him (lxxvii). But Martial (the apostle of the passing moment, I might call him) naturally held him rather cheap (5. 10. 7, 11. 90. 5).

Quintilian's famous judgment of Ennius in 10. 1. 88 contains a mixture of "veneratio" and "despicientia" (cf. 1. 8. 8, 10).¹ He cites verses or parts of verses from the *Annales* not infrequently; commonly, however, these are known to us from other sources. Besides, he usually does not name the *Annales* or even Ennius himself. The tragedies he very seldom cites. In one place, however (9. 3. 26), he gives us valuable information concerning the theme of one of Ennius's *Saturae* (lxxviii-lxxix).

After Quintilian's time Ennius's fame steadily diminished. In the age of the Antonines, however, given as it was to archaism, his memory was inevitably revived (lxxx). In Fronto, Gellius and Apuleius we have many passages of importance from him. In Fronto's letters and those of the Caesars to him Ennius frequently appears (lxxxi-lxxxiii). Gellius shows the greatest

¹ Cf. Skutsch, 2618: "Die Verstösse gegen seine Lektüre bei Martial . . . und bei Quintilian . . . sind wohl bessere Zeichen der Zeit als die Imitationen bei Silius und Statius".

reverence for him, and cites him repeatedly, giving important additions to our stock of fragments.¹ Being a painstaking grammarian Gellius, usually, in citing the *Annales*, gives the book; at the least he tells us that he is citing from the *Annales*. The tragedies, too, he cites often, and accurately, giving regularly the name of the play involved. Finally, in 2. 29, "*De saturis Ennianis egregie meritis est*" (lxxxiii-lxxxvi).

This last matter Vahlen discusses in detail on pages ccxi-ccxiii, a passage which is, to my mind, in some respects the finest in all this splendid book. Vahlen may well point with pride to the fact that he was the first to see that here we have in very deed and truth genuine fragments of Ennius (see his first edition, lxxxix ff.). In sections 3-16 Gellius is giving what seems to be a prose version, ostensibly his own, of a fable of Aesop about an *avicula cassita* (cf. the comment in §§ 1-2, 17-19). Then, in § 20, he adds: *Hunc Aesopi apologum Q. Ennius in satiris scite admodum et venuste versibus quadratis composuit. Quorum duo postremi isti sunt, quos habere cordi et memoriae operae pretium esse hercle puto* (then follow two verses in trochaic tetrameters). There is nothing, then, in the whole chapter that would naturally lead one to suppose that Gellius had Ennius's verse-translation of the Greek before him in §§ 3-16; indeed, all the implications of the chapter lead away from such a conclusion. It would be easy to charge Gellius with disingenuousness; at the least he has stated the facts carelessly, for, as Vahlen noted, fifty years ago, we have in §§ 3-16 not merely "*color quidam antiquitatis*", in the form of archaisms of vocabulary, forms, and syntax, but no small number of parts of trochaic verses can be detected in Gellius's words as they stand, and others can be got by slight transpositions of words. Hence Vahlen concluded in his first edition that "(Gellius) non tam ex Aesopo sua convertisse quam Ennii carmen secutus contexuisse sermonem videtur". Vahlen gave examples both of these archaisms and of these verse-parts in his first edition; in the later book he strengthens his case by further citations along these lines.

Now, in 1894, I published in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler*, 126-171, a paper entitled *Archaism in Aulus Gellius*. I was at that time not familiar at all with Vahlen's

¹ See my discussion of Gellius's attitude toward Ennius, in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler* (1894), 132-133.

Ennius, and so was quite unaware of what he had said about Gellius 2. 29. But I could not fail to note that there were numerous archaisms in this short chapter. In a footnote I give references to places in my paper in which I discussed archaisms in this chapter.¹ To this phase of Gellius's words no one could

¹ See Drisler Studies, 143-144, s. v. *crastini*; 144, s. v. *luci* (*primo luci*); 146, s. v. *fervit*; 159, s. v. *necessum*; 166, s. v. *nidulari. temperi* in §11 should probably be added.

Some archaisms of syntax occur in the chapter (matters of syntax were not handled in the paper to which I have referred).

In §6 we have *dum . . . iret cibum pullis quaesitum*. There seems some warranty for regarding the use of the first supine with a direct object as in Gellius's time an archaism (see Schmalz,⁴ page 465; Draeger 2. 857-865, especially §608). Other examples, some of them striking, in Gellius are 3. 13. 2; 6. 3. 7, 44 (in this chapter Gellius has before him, directly or indirectly, a speech of Cato Censor); 9. 15. 3; (10. 6. 2); 10. 19. 3; 12. 1. 2, 9; 14. 6. 1, 5; 16. 5. 9; 16. 11. 6; 18. 5. 3. For examples of the supine without an object in Gellius see 6. 14. 8; 12. 13. 3. It is to be noted, however, that Rodolf Frobenius, in a dissertation on *Die Syntax des Ennius* (Nördlingen, Beck, 1910), page 67, finds only three examples of this usage (supine with object) in Ennius: our passage, and Ann. (272), 348.

Schmalz, page 565, §325, holds that, after the classical period, *cum* causal, adversative, and concessive appears exclusively with the indicative till we come to Commodianus (so too Draeger 2. 680). Yet it is to me very difficult to see, naturally, anything but causal force (assuming that a *cum*-clause ever has causal force) in Gell. 2. 29. 1 *Aesopus . . . sapiens existimatus est, cum . . . praecepit et censuit*; 6. 3. 25 *dignus . . . laude est cum . . . ingenue ac religiose dicere visus est . . . quod sentiebat et . . . flexit et transtulit* (in this chapter, we noted above, Gellius had Cato Censor before him); 11. 8. 4 *Ne tu . . . nimium nugator es cum maluisti culpam deprecari quam culpa vacare*; 12. 12. 4 *ἀκοινοβήτοι homines estis cum ignoratis*. Considering Gellius's deliberate use of archaisms it seems to me not worth while to seek to explain away the apparent causal force in these examples (this *could* be done in 2. 29. 1, but in the other examples the tense in the main clause makes this difficult indeed).

In §8 we have these words: *Haec ubi ille dixit et discessit*. Schmalz, page 497, §244, characterizes such sentences with *atque* as "ausschliesslich plautinisch mit Nachahmung bei Gellius". Compare Gellius 17. 20. 4 *Haec verba ubi lecta sunt atque ibi Taurus mihi inquit*. For examples in Plautus see Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*, s. v. *atque* 16, page 179. The Plautine examples show only *atque*; Gellius has one example each of *atque* and *et*.

In §7 we have *fac amicos eas et roges*. The word-order is noteworthy: see Vahlen's note, page 208. The nearest parallels are Terence Ad. 917 *tu illas abi et traduce*, and Plautus Am. 32 *propterea pacem advenio et ad vos adfero* (but here the text is disputed). Phrases involving a form of *ire* followed by *et* and a form of another verb occur several times at least in Gellius, e. g. 2. 29. 11 *quin potius imus et oramus*; 14. 2. 23; 20. 10. 5. The usage is

be blind. I saw also clearly enough that in reality throughout this chapter Gellius had had before him Ennius (see page 144, s. v. *crastini*). But, as said above, it had been reserved for Vahlen to detect in Gellius parts of Ennius's verses, by the simple process of reading Gellius aloud. Without a change of a letter, said Vahlen, we get trochaic rhythm in the following: "*ét manus iam pôstulare*;¹ *méssim hanc nobis ádiuvent; stâtim dicto oboédiant; it diés et amici nûlli eunt; fiet nunc dubiô procul; nôn metetur néque necessumst hódie uti vos auferam*". By slight emendations he derived the following: "*vós modo hoc advértite: si quid dicetur dénuo; út iam statim própéret inque aliúm sese asportét locum, alia*".

On these phrases I desire to make one comment. Vahlen twice holds that the *a* in *statim* was long in Ennius. In a footnote to ccxii he refers to his note on Aiac. 1 (= Scen. 17). There he cites Nonius 393. 13 *statim* producta prima syllaba a stando perseveranter et aequaliter significat (quotations follow from Plautus, Terence, Ennius, Afranius). Vahlen then adds: "De prosodia vocis, non de significatione, Nonius videtur falli: cf. Ritscheliuss opp. iv, pp. 274 sqq." But if Nonius was wrong about the prosody, two of Vahlen's examples cited above cease to be perfect verses or parts of verses.² But, under the circumstances, we should not expect throughout perfect verses or parts of verses.

I am not quite sure, even after repeated reading of Vahlen's discussion, whether he regarded his list of verse-parts in our Gellius passage as complete. However, I shall add some others which I seem to have detected: *Avícula est parva, nómen est cassita; filium adulescêntem; operámque mutuám dent* (though here word-accent and ictus less clearly coincide); *Hâec ubi ille*

common in Plautus: see Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*, under *eo(ire)*, B, 2 (entire), p. 503; also *ibid.*, 3 (entire), pp. 503-504, where we have examples of *ire* followed by *atque* or *que* and the forms of another verb; p. 528, under β , p. 529 under ϕ .

¹ In passing I wish to compare with the Ennian-Gellian phrase in § 7, *videsne . . . haec ematuruisse et manus iam pôstulare*, Lucan 1. 28-29, *horrida quod dumis multosque inarata per annos/Hesperia est desuntque manus pôscentibus arvis . . .*

² On *statim* see Palmer on Plaut. Am. 239; Müller, 224. Neither from the two places in Plautus where the word occurs (Am. 239, 276) nor from Terence Ph. 790 can it be shown positively that the *a* is long. Lindsay, however, *The Latin Language*, page 556, accepts "O. Latin *stâtim*".

dixit et discēssit; dōminus (inquiunt) misit qui amicos rogēt, uti luce oriēte/vēniant et metānt (read *quī amicos*: defective verses, to be sure, but still the trochaic swing is marked); *māgnam partem cēssalores sūnt; quin pōtius imus et cognatos ādfinesque nōstros oramus; hōc pulli pāvefācti matri nūntiant; sine metu ac sine cūra sint; frumētum nosmetīpsi manibus nōstris cras melēmus; tempus ēst cedendi et ābeundi; (fiet nunc dubio procul) /quōd futurum dixit.* All these additional examples are won without alteration of the text.

To Apuleius alone we owe our knowledge of the Hedyphagica, as well as the distich (Ann. 62-63) which gives the names of the twelve gods. He cites also a verse of the Thyestes and words of Iphigenia. It appears, then, that he knew the Annales and the tragedies; indeed, says Vahlen, we may readily believe that he "suam orationem colore Enniano distinxisse".

After the time of Gellius and Apuleius Ennius was for a season forgotten, but from the age of Constantine to the end of the reign of Theodosius I, an age of grammarians and of "artium scriptores", he is often mentioned, especially by Nonius Marcellus (lxxxix ff.). Nonius gives us very much from the older writers in general, but "praeter ceteros Ennii carminibus praecipuam et fructuosam operam dedit". From him we derive many new fragments; usually he cites full verses, "nonnumquam sententias plenius quam opus erat perscribens . . ." He gives also, in citing, not merely the poet's name, but the title of the play or the book of the Annales or the Saturae from which he is quoting. Sometimes he uses a quotation from Ennius under different lemmata; on the other hand he often fails to employ in his treatment of a given word an Ennius example of whose existence we have knowledge now from other sources. The long and intricate discussion of these and kindred points is summed up on xcv, with the following results. To Nonius alone we owe most of our knowledge of the Saturae; from him alone we gain what we have of the Ambracia and of the comedies Pancratiastes and Cupuncula. He was ignorant of the Euhemerus and of the Hedyphagetica, perhaps also of the Sota. Of the tragedies he does not use the Alexander and the Iphigenia; in general, however, he used the tragedies more than he did the Annales (contrast the practice of Festus: see above, p. 26). He derived much of his material from the grammarians, particularly Festus and Gellius, perhaps also Varro; "tamen nihil futilius est (de

Ennio loquor) quam credere velle Nonium ad grammaticos et huius generis scriptores potissimum excerptendos se dedisse. Qui si hoc volebat, de Ennii Alexandro et Iphigenia multa discere ex Festo, de Iphigenia multa ex Gellio potuit . . . Quodsi qui tamen affirmare malent Nonium maximam partem glossarum cum exemplis ex nescio quibus glossariis abstulisse, nonne mirum esset, non alios quoque grammaticos sive priores Nonio sive posteriores eosdem fontes adiisse ex iisque hausisse? Quod quia factum non esse apparet, maneat hoc Nonium Ennii carmina et libros studiose pertractasse, hoc est ad eum modum quem veteres omnino huic rei operam dare consuerunt".¹ This discussion and this summary throw interesting light on the much vexed question of Nonius's sources.

Nonius's immediate successors give us little of Ennius, however; Donatus is more fruitful than they (xcvi), but less so than Nonius. Servius again is "unus de locupletissimis de Ennio auctoribus", though even he passed over much that he might have used from Ennius (cii-ciii); further, "ubi Ennius memoratur, non semper primo quo poterat loco, nedum omnibus quibus poterat aut debebat afferri". In his commentary on the Aeneid, which he wrote first, says Vahlen, he cites many verses

¹ I note briefly that to some of these questions Lindsay, Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin, returns a different answer. On page 7 (first full paragraph) and repeatedly in the notes, pages 10 ff., he suggests that readers of Nonius, recalling a quotation from an earlier passage in Nonius, entered it later, where, using the same lemma, the lexicographer supplemented his previous treatment of a word. On page 101 Lindsay agrees with Vahlen in general concerning Nonius's methods of work, holding that "Nonius himself read through the texts or at least the marginal annotations of the texts". Nevertheless he implies, what he nowhere, so far as I have noticed, specifically says, that Nonius owed his quotations from Ennius rather to glossaries or to other authors—e. g. Gellius—than to firsthand study of Ennius himself. He credits Nonius with possessing but a single volume of Ennius, containing the Hectoris Lytra and the Telephus, in that order, and perhaps other plays; see pages 8, 116. In his text-edition of Nonius, 3. 941-943, he gives a long list of passages quoted by Nonius from Ennius. There is one unfortunate result of all this, in that we have in Nonius no long sequences of citations from Ennius, such as we have from other authors, e. g., Plautus, given in strict accordance with the numerical order of the citations in their original setting (see Lindsay, *op. cit.*, *passim*, but especially pages 35-36, 88 ff.; see also above, page 26, n. 1). The editor of the fragments of Ennius is thus deprived of what might have been a very real help; see again my review of Marx's Lucilius, A. J. P. XXVIII 481-482.

from the *Annales*; once only he names the *Annales*, once only he adds the number of the book; elsewhere he gives merely the poet's name, using various methods of citation. He does not cite freely from the plays; once he names the *Iphigenia*, but commonly he merely attaches the poet's name to his citation.

Of most importance, however, in Servius for our purposes are rather "(quae) quaedam generatim afferunt ad res ab Ennio compositas pertinentia" (civ). This sentence Vahlen explains thus: "Dico talia: Aen. I. 20 'audierat' a Iove aut a fatis . . . et perite 'audierat': in Ennio enim inducitur Iuppiter promittens Romanis excidium Carthaginis . . . Versus Ennii non attulit, sed significat quid actum sit apud Ennium in concilio deorum, quaeque ibi Iuppiter promiserit, ea vult Iunonem Vergilianam audisse . . .". So again in his note on Aen. I. 281 "ne nunc quidem versum Ennii afferre voluit, sed sententiam indicare, quae fortasse pluribus verbis exposita erat. Videmus Servium attendere si quid est in Ennii annalibus quod convertere ad interpretandam Vergilii compositionem liceat". "Eaque omnia quae huius generis sunt unius Servii beneficio nituntur". More examples of all this follow on civ-cv.

Most of the hexameters cited by Servius in notes on the *Aeneid* as from Ennius are unknown from other sources; many of these, again, come from Daniel's Servius. Not full verses are cited, but full thoughts, whether these take less or more than one verse. Though Servius errs at times in his citations of Plautus, Terence, etc., Vahlen thinks he is generally right in his quotations from Ennius (cv-cvi). On pages cvi-cviii Vahlen discusses in detail certain modes of citation, apparently, from Ennius in the notes on the *Aeneid*, which, if not rightly understood, will greatly mislead the student.

The commentary on the *Eclogues* gives us just two "*frustula Enniana*", of two words each, whose place in Ennius cannot be determined. The notes on the *Georgics* are richer in *Enniana*; the mode of citation, again, from the *Annales* differs from that used in the commentary on the *Aeneid*, for here, though some verses are cited merely by Ennius's name, most are referred to a definite book (cix-cx). Citations from the plays are very rare in this commentary.

On pages cx-cxiii Vahlen discusses the *Enniana* to be found in the *Scholia Vergiliana* (*Bernensia* and *Veronensia*) and in the

Commentary on the Eclogues and the Georgics ascribed to M. Valerius Probus.

This brings us to Macrobius (cxiii ff.). Once again Ennius is falling into disfavor, for in Sat. 1. 4. 17, Servius, about to cite him, says, by way of preface, Ennius, nisi cui videtur inter nostrae aetatis politiores munditias respuendus (cf. 6. 3. 9; 6. 9. 9). In the first books of the Saturnalia we have but a few citations from Ennius, widely scattered; "a sexto autem Saturnalium libro totum *θύλακον* versuum Ennianorum excutere coepit", because "in sexto quanta pars carminum Vergilii ad scriptores Romanos superioris aevi redeat explanare studuit. Inter quos Ennius principem locum obtinet". What he purposes to do he sets forth in 6. 1. 7. Then in §§ 8-24 follow a list of Vergil's borrowings from Ennius; we get throughout complete verses (or pairs of verses) from Ennius, from the Annales, but not always complete sense. If more than one citation from Ennius is given in a single section, these are given in the order of the books; so in § 9 we have citations from the first, the third and the tenth books; in § 17 we have citations from Books 4 and 17. If we view §§ 15-21 together, we find citations running thus: from Books 1, 3, 4 (and 16 in § 17), 6, 7, 8, 17. Section 22 shows passages from Books 6, 8, 17.¹ Most of these verses, furthermore, we owe to Macrobius alone (cxiv-cxv).

In 6. 2. 1 Macrobius declares his intention nunc locos locis componere . . . ut unde formati sint quasi de speculo cognoscas. In § 16 he comes to Ennius; he cites some passages from the Annales, some from the tragedies and the Scipio. We get now, naturally, passages of two or more verses; all these we owe to Macrobius alone. Finally, in §§ 30-32, without citation of definite verses, he indicates various passages in which Vergil was deeply indebted to Naevius and to Ennius. Here again Macrobius is our sole authority. In 6. 3, in setting forth verses which Vergil might well enough have derived from Homer, though they had been used by Roman poets before him, he cites more Enniana. See further cxvi-cxvii. Vahlen sums up by declaring that Macrobius "inter meritissimos de Enni memoria grammaticos referri par (est)".

On pages cxviii-cxxii Vahlen discusses the attempts that have been made to find Enniana in Claudianus; on pages cxxii-cxxiv

¹ See above on Verrius Flaccus's and Nonius's mode of citation, p. 26. Cf. also p. 32, n. 1, at end.

Jerome and Augustine come in for mention ; so also Priscian and Isidorus (cxxiv-cxxix). Priscian cites very often from the *Annales*, sometimes too from the tragedies. He cites generally full verses, giving a complete thought. He gives also not merely the poet's name, but the title of the work and the number of the book. Frequently, too, he is our sole source for the verses he quotes. Vahlen believes (cxxvi) that Priscian read and excerpted Ennius for himself. Isidorus, finally, cites by the poet's name alone, without title of work or number of book.

Not content with having traced the *vestigia Ennii* thus far Vahlen brings together (cxxviff.) a few references to Ennius in the days after Isidorus, though he declares that he did not regard it as his duty "*Ennii memoriam etiam per medii aevi quod vocatur tempora persequi*". Then comes a discussion of the various editions of Ennius, older and later, and, finally (cxxxvii-cxliv), an account of the *Novae Editionis Subsidia*, that is, of the authoritative editions of the various authors whose names recur so often in the *testimonia* of our book (see above, page 3).

Here I must stop for the present. Some day, perhaps, I shall recur to the subject, by writing a commentary on the fragments, and discussing in connection therewith the second part of Vahlen's *Prolegomena*, entitled *De Libris Ennianis*. I had planned to include the latter discussion in the present paper, but the studies required by this article have made it entirely clear that the rest of the *Prolegomena* can be best treated only in connection with a virtual commentary on the fragments.

Let me close, then, as I began, by an expression of my profound admiration of the enormous industry and patience and of the wondrous scholarship displayed throughout this book. I am aware that at many points I have ventured to question the soundness of the conclusions based by Vahlen on the facts he adduces. That result, I submit, was inevitable ; in view of the scantiness of our fragments, after all, it is most hazardous to base conjectures and inferences, at least of certain kinds, upon them ; inevitably, therefore, any careful and lengthy examination of this book would seem to emphasize unduly points of difference between the author and the reviewer.

CHARLES KNAPP.

II.—THE INDO-EUROPEAN PALATALS IN SANSKRIT.

1. The Indic and the Iranian languages differ greatly in their treatment of the IE. stopped consonants. We are struck by the frequent change of stops to spirants in Iranian, as opposed to the conservative history, in this respect, of the Sanskrit. The former is a spirantizing language, like the old Germanic.

Thus the Iranian shows us spirants for the IE. aspirated voiceless stops, as in Av. *paθ-a* O. P. *paθi-m* (Sk. *path- pathi-*), and for the IE. voiceless stops before consonants, as in Av. *āfš* (Sk. *āp*), *suxra-* O. P. *θuxra-* (Sk. *śukrā-s*), Av. *θwqm* O. P. *θ(u)wam* (Sk. *tvām*).¹

The Younger Avestan, moreover, shows us spirants for the IE. aspirated and simple voiced stops, as in *aiwi* (Sk. *abhi*) and *γnā* (Sk. *gnā*). We may note also such YAv. double spirants as in *uxda-* (Sk. *ukthā-m*) and *vaxδra-* (Sk. *vaktrā-m*).

2. To recall these well-known facts would be, strictly speaking, sufficient for our purposes in the present discussion: it may, however, be instructive to consider briefly what physiological causes probably brought about these changes of pronunciation in Iranian and Younger Avestan.

The spirantizing of voiceless aspirates in Iranian is parallel to that in Germanic, and may like the latter be attributed to a pronunciation with *increased stress of breath*. Cf. especially H. Meyer, Z. f. d. Alt. 45, 101 ff. The agreement of Iranian and Germanic in not spirantizing these sounds after a spirant, as in Av. *spara-t* (Sk. *sphurā-ti*) is significant not only of a like cause for the Iranian and the Germanic phenomena, but also of this particular cause: for the utterance of a preceding spirant, in requiring a comparatively great volume of breath, lessens the breath stress for the following stop and so prevents spirantiza-

¹ As constant reference to an often divergent set of views might prove confusing, we may here refer once for all to the treatment of the IE. palatals in Aryan in Brugmann's *Grundriss* I², §§ 610-618. 714-720. 1007, 12, which has been looked upon as the standard view of the subject. All examples are taken from the *Grundriss* and from Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*², §§ 142. 145-147. 214-224, c. 612, d. 617, b. 832, a. 833, a. 890, a.

tion. Similarly in E. *ten* we pronounce an aspirated fortis, *ten* or *then*, but in E. *step* a simple fortis or voiceless lenis, *step* or *sdep*. So also G. *tut* vs. *Stule*, Dan. *Time* vs. *Stime*; and it is conceivable that the very great breath stress of Dan. *Time* may in time produce *θime* while the *t* in *Stime* would be retained as a stop.

The similar retention of the stop after nasals in Iranian, as in Av. *pantā* (Sk. *pānthā-s*) is an indication that breath stress was weaker here than in Germanic, where spirantization took place in spite of the escape of breath in a preceding nasal. Another indication of such a difference between Iranian and Germanic is the retention in Iranian of voiceless unaspirated stops. The general increase of breath stress in Iranian was sufficient to make spirants of voiceless stops followed by aspiration (with open glottis), but not of voiceless stops immediately followed by closing of the vocal chords for a vowel, as in Av. *pita* O. P. *pītā* (Sk. *pītā*). Before a consonant, however, where the closing of the vocal chords was not so immediate, spirantization took place, as in the examples above given. This is an illustration of the familiar fact that the utterance of a voiceless sound, i. e., of one with open position of the glottis, involves the passing through the mouth of far more breath than the utterance of a voiced sound, during which the vocal chords are closed and allow breath to pass only in the interstices of their vibration,—compare the well-known experiment of trying to blow out a candle first with a voiced, then with a voiceless sound.

Thus we may perhaps also explain the fact that the voiced stops became voiceless in Germanic, but in Iranian, where the breath stress was weaker, remained sonant. This is for various reasons a most doubtful matter, as is also the spirantizing of the voiced aspirates in Germanic; suffice it therefore to note that in Germanic both these classes of sounds were changed to sounds requiring more breath for utterance, whereas in Iranian this was not the case, aspirate and simple sonant stops here coinciding, most probably as simple sonant stops.

A different explanation is necessary for the phenomena of Younger Avestan. Here the Iranian voiced stops became voiced spirants. Increased breath stress alone would probably have turned these sounds into voiceless stops, as in Germanic and later in High German and Danish; it seems rather as if in the Younger Avestan *looseness of articulation* were involved. This

is surely the case where Younger Avestan changed Iran. *ft χt* to *fd xδ*, as in *uxδa-* and *vaxδra-*. Such groups as *ft χt* can be conveniently pronounced with any degree or increase of breath stress; they are stable in such highly stressed languages as English, German, and Danish. The YAv. change to double spirants is a decided sign of loose articulation of stops.

3. It is probable, then, that the Iranian dialects diverged from the Sanskrit in being spoken with increased breath stress, and that the Younger Avestan further differed in loosely articulating its stops. However this may be, it is certain that the Iranian languages differed from the Sanskrit in *tending toward spirant pronunciation of stopped consonants*, and that this is especially true of the Younger Avestan. In the following pages, whenever mention is made of the "stronger breath stress of the Iranian" or "looser articulation of the Avestan", the empirical reader will always be able to substitute the words "more spirant pronunciation" without in any way affecting the argument. To what extent the greater conservatism of Sanskrit is due to the greater antiquity of the language in our records need not here concern us: the nature of the divergence between early Iranian and Sanskrit as we know them is all that will affect our present considerations.¹

4. This difference between the phonetic character of Iranian and Sanskrit may help us to understand the differing development of the IE. palatals in the two languages. We should first have to form a hypothesis, however, as to the character of these sounds in Indo-European, were it not that the opinion of Brugmann (Gr. I², § 543 and K. Vgl. Gr. § 157) has found general acceptance. Brugmann's view is that the stop-articulation of these sounds is the more original; that they were in Indo-European slightly palatalized *k*-sounds (*k' k'h g' g'h*) which in the development of the so-called *centum* languages were not distinguished from simple velar consonants, but in the eastern (*satəm*) languages became sibilants. Phonetic parallels are of course in favor of this view, for the gradual change of slightly palatalized velars to sibilants is a familiar phenomenon. A palatalized velar *k' g'* is pronounced as a simple stop articulated somewhat farther forward in the mouth than a plain velar (French

¹ In the above and following paragraphs theorizing as to the nature of the IE. voiced aspirate stops has been avoided,—or rather, it has been relegated from here to a note at the end of these remarks.

dialects, Norwegian dialects, Lithuanian, modern Slavic languages, Magyar).¹ Articulation of the middle tongue against the higher parts of the palate is not so rapid or precise as in other parts of the mouth. Especially as the removal of the tongue after the stop is not so quick as after a velar or dental, the resulting acoustic effect resembles an affricate,—the stop being followed by the sound of the breath passing between the palate and the tongue ($k' > k'h > k'χ'$). Cf. Brugmann Gr. I², § 47, 1. Meanwhile the point of articulation passes forward, approaching that of dental consonants ($k'χ' > t's'$), as in Old French (ch, g), English, Norwegian, Swedish, Slavic languages. In some languages, which tend to articulate either with the back or with the tip of the tongue and not with intermediate points, the palatal character of $t's', d'ž'$ may be nearly or wholly given up, the result resembling $tš, dž$, as in Italian and English. Where the palatal character is retained the stop grows less and less close and is finally assimilated to the spirant: the result is a more or less palatal $š, s$, or $ś$ sound, as in modern French ($c ch, g$), Italian dialects ($š', ž'$, cf. Passy, *Petite Phonétique Comparée*, p. 85), Portuguese (c, g), and modern Slavic languages. As the reverse of this process is very rare—if indeed it be not inconceivable,—we must assume for the IE. palatals a pronunciation $k' k'h g' g'h$. From this developed the sibilants of the *satəm* languages.

5. The standard view then supposes that in all the so-called *satəm* languages—and therefore in all Aryan and long before any distinction between Iranian and Indic—this development had uniformly taken place; in other words, that any and all Iranian and Sanskrit representations of the IE. palatals are later forms of Ar. sibilants $š' š'h ž' ž'h$ (before stops $š ž$, before sibilants $χ γ$).

This hypothesis does very well for the facts of Iranian, where the IE. palatals are everywhere pronounced as sibilants, e. g., Av. *vasō* O. P. *vasiγ* (Gr. *έκων*), Av. *zī-zanāt* O. P. *vispa- z(a)na-* (Gr. *γένος*), Av. *hazah-* (Gr. *έχω* Goth. *sigis*),—as sibilants even in the combinations IE. $\tilde{k}s \tilde{g}zh$, e. g., Av. *aša-* (Gr. *άξων*), Av. *uz-važat* (Lat. *vexit*). We know, moreover, that these sibilants were well on in their development in the Aryan period, for the new palatals which in Aryan times developed from IE. velars and labiovelars before IE. front vowels did not coincide with the

¹ An early stage is heard in the German pronunciation, e. g., of *Kind* as opposed to *Kalb* and *Kuchen*.

old IE. palatals, but remained as palatal stops or affricates \check{c} \check{j} , as in Av. *čit* O. P. *čiy* (Sk. *cid*), Av. *jvaiti* O. P. *jvāhy* (Sk. *jīva-ti*). In other words: before the palatalization in Aryan times (earlier than IE. \check{c} $\check{ō} > \check{ā}$) of IE. velars and labiovelars, the IE. palatals had developed so far that the new palatals never coincided with them—never “caught up” with them:—the IE. palatals had, we may safely say, developed into sibilants.

This, the standard view, is further supported when we consider the characteristics of Iranian mentioned in §§ 1-3. Strong breath stress (or at any rate spirant tendency) in pronouncing k' g' makes the spirant glide more noticeable than otherwise, so that the affricate stage is more quickly reached than where the breath stress is weaker. Strong breath stress (especially if combined with loose tongue articulation) hastens the weakening of the stop element and its assimilation to the spirant element. Iran. s z were somewhat palatal sibilants, cf. such spellings (or dialectic forms) as O. P. *a-θaha^h* (Av. *saxha te* Sk. *śaśa-ti*), *ā-yadana-* (Av. *yazaite* Sk. *yā'a-tē*). The development of IE. $\check{k}s$ $\check{g}zh$ from $k's$ $g'zh$ through more and more relaxed and spirant articulations to \check{s} \check{z} is also natural; it is of little moment whether or not we assume an intermediate stage $\chi\check{s}$ $\gamma\check{z}$: some such thing there must have been.

6. When we come to the Sanskrit, however, we find the conditions—as indeed we might expect them—quite different. IE. \check{k} before vowels, semivowels, nasals, and r has, to be sure, gone through the development to the palatal sibilant \check{s} as in *vaś'mi* (Gr. *ἰκών*); note especially the conversion of s before Sk. palatals to the same sound as in *tātaś' ca*.

Aside from this case (and one other), however, the facts differ greatly from those of Iranian. To begin with, IE. \check{g} before vowels, semivowels, etc., has in early Sanskrit times the pronunciation of a simple voiced palatal stop g' or better d' (written j as in *jānas-*), coinciding with the d' developed in Aryan from IE. velars and labiovelars before IE. front vowels (as in *jīva-ti*). As to the character of this sound in early times, cf. Whitney, l. c., § 44, a and especially Brugmann, K. Vgl. Gr., § 22, 4, with references. As was inevitable, this sound came to assume a spirant glide (cf. § 4), but in classical times it never acquired the metrical value of a double consonant and was never considered otherwise than as a simple voiced stop. According to the standard view, now, this palatal stop is a development from an Ar. sibilant \check{s} —a

reversion, as it were, to an older state: IE. \hat{g} ($= g'$) $>$ Ar. ḡ $>$ Sk. j ($= d'$),—cf. for instance Brugmann, Gr. I², § 62, Anm. 2. Phonetically this is of course most unlikely,—just as it is unlikely that the k -sounds of the *centum* languages are derived from sibilants like those of the *satəm* languages, cf. § 4.

The same holds true of the IE. palatal voiced aspirate: in Sanskrit IE. $\hat{g}h$ and Ar. $g'h$ ($<$ IE. gh guh before front vowels) are represented alike as h , e. g. *sáhas-* (Av. *hazah-* Goth. *sigis*) and *hán-ti* (Av. *jainti* Gr. *θεῖνω*). Here, indeed, it might be urged that the representation in Sanskrit of IE. $\hat{g}h >$ Ar. $\text{ḡ}h$ had not “reverted” so as to coincide with that of Ar. $g'h$, but that the two sounds never had coincided until they both became h ;—in other words, that IE. $\hat{g}h >$ Ar. $\text{ḡ}h >$ Sk. h and that Ar. $g'h >$ Sk. h . Unfortunately for the current view of this matter there is an obstacle to this assumption: the Sanskrit law of deaspiration, when operating on IE. $\hat{g}h$ leaves the usual representation of IE. g , namely j ($= d'$) as in *jānghā* ($<$ IE. $*\hat{g}henghā$, Goth. *gaggs*). Hence the current view of this subject is forced to assume that here too the Ar. sibilant $\text{ḡ}h$ acquired stop value in Sanskrit, that IE. $\hat{g}h$ ($= g'h$) $>$ Ar. $\text{ḡ}h >$ Sk. $*jh$ ($= d'h$) $>$ Sk. h or j ($= d'$). Moreover this return of the sibilant to stop value must have been very early, since Sanskrit deaspiration took place before the change of zh to s , ṣ , cf. Brugmann, Gr. I², § 827.

Finally there are a few cases of IE. $s\hat{k}(h)$, where we find these sounds represented by Sk. $(c)ch$, as in *chinát-ti* (Gr. *οχιζω*), *ducchínā* (*du ṣ + ṣ unā*). This $(c)ch$ makes the preceding vowel “long by position” (Whitney, l. c., §§ 44, a. 227); it is also produced by the combination of $-t \text{ ṣ'}$ as in *tac chakyam* (*tat + ṣ'akyam*): hence its character as a double sound, namely as a palatal affricate ($t'\text{ṣ'}$) is plain. Note also the phonetic spelling $c\text{ṣ'}$. Here again the standard view is forced to suppose that IE. $s\hat{k}(h)$ ($= sk'(h)$) $>$ Ar. $\text{ṣ'ṣ'}(h) >$ Sk. $(c)ch$ ($= t'\text{ṣ'}$)—again a development contrary to the usual course of such sounds and to the course which such sounds had previously taken in the same language.

7. The current supposition, in short, is that the IE. palatals developed uniformly over the entire Aryan territory: that their spirantization and stop-loosening was as fast in the otherwise “conservative” Sanskrit territory as in the Iranian with its spirant tendency; that when Sanskrit and Iranian grew to be

separate languages the former as well as the latter pronounced the IE. palatals as sibilants ś śh ṣ ṣh . The Sanskrit, however,—repenting the precipitate course it had taken in company with the Iranian,—changed ś ś(h) ($< \text{IE. } s\hat{k}(h)$) back to $(c)ch (= t's')$, ṣ back to $j (= d')$, and ṣh back to $jh (= d'h, \text{ later } d' \text{ or } h)$, leaving only ś at the end of the alphabet as a spirant,—a last trace of the bad company and profligate habits of the past.

If we examine the actual forms of the Sanskrit language, however, we find nothing anomalous; and if, in tracing the origin of these forms and in comparing them to Iranian forms, we keep in mind the physiologic aspect of the process of palatalization (outlined in §4) and apply what we know about the difference between Iranian and Sanskrit treatment of consonants (cf. §§ 1-3), we shall probably find in the history of the IE. palatals in Sanskrit nothing unusual or surprising. Beginning with the Indo-European, we shall now try to reconstruct this history.

8. The IE. palatals $\hat{k} \hat{k}h \hat{g} \hat{g}h$ (probably pronounced $k' k'h g' g'h$, cf. §4) seem to have gone rapidly along the course of palatalization in one part of the Aryan territory (in which otherwise also spirant tendency later appears), namely in that dialect which later became the Iranian language; for, when the Ar. velars ($< \text{IE. velars and labiovelars}$) became palatal before front vowels, these new palatals were in this dialect distinct from the old palatals.¹ At the end of the Aryan period then, the Iranian started out with one set of more or less purely spirant palatal sounds, say ś śh ṣ ṣh , and one set of (new) palatal stops $k' k'h g' g'h$.

The further history of the palatals in Iranian is clear (cf. §5). The old palatals, if not already pronounced as sibilants soon reached this pronunciation. Examples are:

- (a) Av. s ($< \text{IE. } \hat{k}$): *vasō* O. P. *vasiy* (Gr. *έκων*).
 ($< \text{IE. } s\hat{k}$): *jasaiti* (Gr. *βάσκε*).
 ($< \text{IE. } s\hat{k}h$): *hi-sidyāt* (Gr. *σίζω*).
 ($< \text{IE. } \hat{k}s\hat{k}$): *parṣaiti* ($< \text{IE. } *p\check{r}\hat{k}-s\hat{k}e-ti$).
 (b) Av. z ($< \text{IE. } \hat{g}$): *zī-zanať* O. P. *vispa-z(a)na-*
 (Gr. *γίvos*).
 ($< \text{IE. } \hat{g}h$): *hazah-* (Gr. *ἔχω* Goth. *sigis*).
 ($< \text{IE. } z\hat{g}h$): GAv. *zaē-mā* (Gr. *σχοίμεν*).

¹ This is much like the state of things in the Slavic languages, e. g. modern Russian, where several degrees of palatalization coexist.

- (c) Av. \check{s} (< IE. $\check{k}s$): *aša-* (Gr. $\alpha\sigma\alpha$).
 (< IE. $\check{k}p$): *šiti-š* (Gr. $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$).
 (< IE. $\check{k}ph$): *rašō* (Gr. $\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\omega$).
 (< IE. $\check{k}-t$): *vašti* (Gr. $\epsilon\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$).
 (< IE. $\check{k}-q$): *saškuš-təmō* (< IE.* $\check{k}e-\check{k}q$).
 (d) Av. \check{z} (< IE. $\check{g}zh$): *uz-vašaṭ* (Lat. *vexit*).
 (< IE. $\check{g}-d$): *məršdikəm* (< IE.* $mr\check{g}-d$).
 (< IE. $\check{g}-dh$): *važdri-š* (< IE.* $ue\check{g}h$).
 (< IE. $\check{g}-bh$): GAv. *višibyo* (dat. abl. pl. of *vis*).

The new palatals became \check{c} and \check{j} , probably palatal affricates, except in positions where stops became spirant (cf. § 2). In such positions \check{s} and \check{z} were spoken: the coincidence under these conditions with certain representations of the old palatals, (c) and (d) above, affords the best possible example of the connection between spirantizing tendencies and tendencies which accelerate palatalization. Examples:

- (e) Av. \check{c} (< Ar. k'): *čit* O. P. *čiy* (Gr. $\tau\iota$).
 (f) Av. \check{j} (< Ar. g'): *jvaiti* O. P. *jvāhy* (Gr. $\delta\lambda\alpha\upsilon\alpha$).
 (< Ar. $g'h$): *jāinti* O. P. *a-jānam* (Gr. $\theta\epsilon\iota\omega$).
 (c) Av. \check{s} (< Ar. k'): GAv. *vašyetē* (Gr. $\epsilon\pi\omega\varsigma$).
 (d) Av. \check{z} (< Ar. g'): *dažaiti* (Goth. *dags*, Lith. *degù*).
 (< Ar. $g'h$): *snāžaiti* (Gr. $\nu\iota\phi\alpha$).

9. In that dialect of Aryan which later became the Indic language the spirantizing tendency of usual speech was less than in the sister dialect. Consequently palatalization proceeded much less rapidly.

In the utterance of unvoiced sounds, where the glottis is open, more breath is passed through the mouth than in the utterance of voiced sounds.¹ Unvoiced palatal stops, therefore, are more susceptible to affrication and spirantization than voiced stops. In a language where the breath stress is at all strong—strong enough to develop even a voiced palatal with some rapidity—this difference does not show itself; in the early history of Sanskrit, however, we must ascribe to it the more rapid development of IE. \check{k} ($\check{k}h$) as compared to \check{g} ($\check{g}h$).²

¹ Cf. the candle experiment cited in § 2.

² Similarly perhaps F. *ciel* (< Lat. *caelum*), but *gendre* (< Lat. *gener*), with \check{s} and \check{z} . French breath stress is decidedly weak.

As a consequence of this more rapid development of IE. \widehat{k} it came about that when the new Aryan palatals developed from velars before front vowels, the IE. *unvoiced* \widehat{k} was already well along toward spirantization, but the IE. *voiced* palatals \widehat{g} $\widehat{g}h$ were still stops and accordingly coincided with the new voiced palatal stops Ar. g' $g'h$.

In the combinations IE. $s\widehat{k}$ and $s\widehat{k}h$ the IE. palatal did not develop so rapidly as in independent \widehat{k} because the preceding s here lessened the breath stress for the following \widehat{k} $\widehat{k}h$, cf. § 2. The s was assimilated to the following palatal, becoming a palatal sibilant,—cf. the similar change later in Sanskrit, as in *tataś' ca* from *tatas + ca*. Thus IE. $s\widehat{k}(h)$ ($= s\widehat{k}'(h)$) became $\acute{s}k'h > \acute{s}'k'x' > \acute{s}'t's'$ which was then simplified to $t's'$ ¹—written (c) ch and pronounced as a prolonged t' plus decided spirant glide, cf. *tac chakyam* in later times from *tat + ś'akyam* (§ 6), but *tac ca* pronounced *tat'-l'a* (with much slighter glide) and written without the h , from *tat + ca*—the c in *ca* being t' with a slight glide. IE. $s\widehat{k}$ also occurs in the compounds *ducchínā* (*duś + ś'unā*) and *páruccēpa* (*paruś + ś'ēpa*).—IE. $\widehat{k}s\widehat{k}$ either became $s\widehat{k}$ as in Latin *posco* (Brugmann, Gr. I², § 707, Anm.); or, if this change is not to be assumed for Aryan, it became $\widehat{k}\widehat{k}$ where the lengthened tongue pressure incident to articulation of a double stop preserved the stop value, giving Sk. $t's'$, ($(c)ch$), cf. below.

What has been said in the last three paragraphs applies to the IE. palatals before vowels, semivowels, nasals, and r . In these positions, then, Sanskrit possessed at the end of the Aryan period the following sounds: unvoiced: \acute{s} , $t's'$, k' (Ar. palatal); voiced: g' (IE. palatal and Ar. palatal), $g'h$ (IE. palatal and Ar. palatal), $g'g'$ (Ar. palatal, from older zg').

These sounds suffered little change in Sanskrit. In historic times \acute{s} had reached palatal sibilant pronunciation. $t's'$ written (c) ch was a palatal affricate: both $t's'$ as well as $k' g' g'h g'g'$ were spoken with the front rather than the middle of the tongue; the latter set of sounds early added a spirant glide, and were later different from the dentals scarcely in any respect but this. We write t' (Sk. c), d' (Sk. j), $d'h$ (Sk. $*jh > j, h$), $d'd'$ (Sk. jj). As for this last sound: it in no case represents an IE. palatal,

¹ For an analogous simplification, cf. prim. Slavic $\acute{s}t's' >$ Slov. and Russ. $t's'$ (as in *sveča*). Brugmann, Gr. I², § 316, Anm. 2. Cf. also Sk. $vr̥k̐ti < *vr̥k̐ti$, $\acute{s}ik̐ti < *s̥ik̐ti$.

but always Ar. *zg'*, which developed like IE. *sk̑*, except that in the voiced sound the final spirant glide was less noticeable. Hence the parallelism of Ar. *zg'* > Sk. *d'd'* with Sk. *cc* rather than *(c)ch*. Cf. also *taj jalām* for *tad + jalām*. Where *d'h* was not deaspirated the voiced stop element was lost, leaving voiced *h*.¹ Thus, in the positions named, the Sanskrit spoke:

- (a) Sk. *ṣ'* (< IE. *k̑*): *vāṣ'mi* (Gr. *ἑκών*).
- (b) Sk. *(c)ch* (pr. *č'*, < IE. *sk̑*): *gāccha-ti* (Gr. *βάσκε*).
 (< IE. *skh*): *chināt-ti* (Gr. *σχιζω*).
 (< IE. *ksk*): *pr̥cchā-ti* (< IE. **pr̥k-ske-ti*).
- (c) Sk. *j* (pr. *d'*, < IE. *ǵ*): *jānas-* (Gr. *γίvos*).
 (< IE. *ǵh*): *jānghā* (Goth. *gaggs*).
 (< Ar. *g'*): *jīva-ti* (Gr. *διαίρα*).
 (< Ar. *g'h*): *ja-ghāna* (Gr. *θεῖνω*, *ἑ-πεφνον*).
- (d) Sk. *h* (voiced sound, < IE. *ǵh*): *sāhas-* (Gr. *ἑχω*,
 Goth. *sigis*).
 (< Ar. *g'h*): *hān-ti* (Gr. *θεῖνω*).
- (e) Sk. *c* (pr. *č'*, < Ar. *k'*): *ci-d* (Gr. *τι*).
- (f) Sk. *jj* (pr. *d'd'*, < Ar. *zg'*): *mājja-ti* (Lith. *mazgótī*).

10. Before sibilants the IE. palatals *k̑ g̑* appear in Sanskrit as *k̑*. Even here IE. *k̑ g̑* must in Aryan times have possessed some palatalization, though much less than in the same combination in the Iranian part of the territory. We may suppose that IE. *k̑s* was in pre-Indic *k̑š*. Whatever spirant glide may have followed *k̑* was of course lost in the sound of the *š*: as the palatalization of the *k̑* was thus scarcely noticeable, the combination was finally pronounced *k̑š*, coinciding with *k̑š* < IE. *qs*, *qus*.

The combination IE. *ǵzh* is also found in Sanskrit as *k̑š*. Now voiced sibilants (except for the sibilant glide of *d'* or *d'd'*) were not pronounced in Sanskrit, but were lost. We may suppose that the Sanskrit breath stress was too weak to enounce a sibilant with closed glottis—of this more below. In Sanskrit pronunciation, then, *zh* would have been lost. We must therefore ascribe the change of IE. *zh* to *š* to a pre-Sanskrit stage—perhaps to a dialectic change in the Aryan period. In this, Sanskrit resembles Celtic and Germanic, in which also the normal processes of the language acted on a basis of pre-Celt. and pre-Germ.

¹ This pronunciation will be spoken of in the note on the IE. sonant aspirates.

ks ts ps and not *gzh dzh bzh* (cf. Brugmann, Gr. I², §§ 766, 2. 796, b. 827). It is worth noting also that the Iranian alone has preserved the combinations in question as voiced sounds. In Sanskrit, then, IE. *gzh* > *kʼs* (for "aspiration" attached to a voiceless *s* sound means nothing) > *kṣ*. Examples:

- (g) Sk. *kṣ* (< IE. *k̂s*): *ákṣa-s* (Gr. *ἀξων*).
 (< IE. *k̂p*): *kṣitt-ṣ* (Gr. *κτισις*).
 (< IE. *k̂ph*): *rdakṣas-* Gr. *ῥέχθω*.
 (< IE. *gzh*): *a-vākṣit* (Lat. *vexit*).
 (< IE. *gđh*): *kṣam-* (Gr. *χών*).

11. The statements in the preceding § do not apply to IE. *k̂ g* + sibilant *before stops* (i. e. before *t d*, as no other case seems to occur). In this position IE. *k̂s g̃z* did not become Sk. *kṣ* because the *s* dropped out before the preceding IE. palatals had lost their palatal value. Thus IE. *k̂st* > Ar. *kʼst* > *kʼt* and IE. *g̃zd* > Ar. *gʼzd* > *gʼd*. Cf., for the law of dropping sibilants between stops in Sanskrit, Brugmann, Gr. I², § 828 (who, however, does not draw the necessary conclusions about the cases involving IE. palatals). This process is decidedly natural for a language with weak breath stress, where a sibilant between stops is at best weakly pronounced. In the case of the voiced combination we need only remember that the Sanskrit nowhere pronounced a voiced sibilant. The early date of this law appears in the treatment of *rap̃śá-lē* < **rap̃-s̃kē*: here the *s* dropped out before the general pronunciation of *k̂* and its pronunciation in the combination *s̃k̂* had diverged: i. e. before the former had lost its stop value.

The word *pr̃cchā-ti* (§ 9) may also be an illustration of this law, unless, like Lat. *posco*, we suppose it earlier to have dropped the first *k̂*.

12. To return to Sk. *kṣ*. When Sanskrit reduced its final consonant groups to simple consonants, final *-kṣ* had to become *-k*.

It is natural, however, that during the operation of the law spoken of in § 11 even final IE. *-k̂s* was affected when it came before stops. Thus **rākʼś tatra* was spoken **rākʼ tatra*. Such forms as **rākʼ* survived and were spoken alongside the forms in *-k̂* < *-kṣ*, competing with them, as we shall see, at some advantage.

In historic times forms with final *-k̂* < IE. palatal were used as follows,—*-kʼ* having everywhere else superseded *-k̂*:—exclu-

sively in the roots and root-stems *diś-*, *drś-*, *sprś-*, *ruj-*,¹ *dih-*;² in the stems *īrj-*,³ *bhiṣāj-*,⁴ *ṛtvij-*;⁵ optionally in the root *naś* 'attain'.⁶

Sporadic instances of forms with final *-k*, where *-k'* has generally been adopted, are the following: (RV. :) *anāk* (stem *anākṣ-*, cf. *nāś'a-ti*), *āmyak* (root *myakṣ-*, cf. *miś'ra-s*); (Vedic:) *prāṇ-adhṛk* *dadhṛk* (root *drñh-*, cf. Av. *darzayeiti*, Uhlenbeck, l. c., s. v. *dṛhyati*), *puruspṛk* (root *sprñh-*, cf. Av. *sparz-*, Uhlenbeck, l. c., s. v. *sprhayati*); (*Māitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā*:) *viś'vasrk* (root *srj-*, cf. Av. *hərzaitei*, Uhlenbeck, l. c., s. v. *srjāti*). Here belong finally the Vedic *s*-aorist forms *asrāk* (root *srj-*) and *adrāk* (root *drś-*), when used as 2d person sg.

As for the competing forms with *-k'*, they will be spoken of below.

13. At the time of the simplification of final consonant groups final *-k't* (either < IE. *-kēt* or < IE. *-kēst* by the law in § 11) became *-k'*. Thus IE. *-kēt* and *-kēst* always gave *-k'* and IE. *-kēs* sometimes gave *-k'*, sometimes *-k*.

14. At the time of the simplification of final consonant groups IE. *k̂ ĝ* before stops were still uniformly palatal stops *k' g'*. Breath stress in Sanskrit, we may suppose, was too weak for the formation of a spirant or sibilant glide between stops—cf. the earlier dropping of *s* between stops, § 11.

After the time of the simplification of final consonant groups, however, IE. *k̂ ĝ* before *t d, dh* lost their stop articulation. Concretely expressed: the tongue, instead of passing from a vowel position (1) upward to form a palatal stop (2) and then

¹ The final of *ruj-* is not treated in Sanskrit as an IE. palatal, but, wherever the treatment of the two would necessarily differ, as an Ar. velar. Historically, however, the final of *ruj-* is probably an IE. palatal, cf. Lith. *lūstī*, *lūšyti*, Russ. *luznut'*, mentioned by Uhlenbeck, Et. Wb. d. Ai. Spr., s. v. *rujdti*.

² The final of *dih-* is not treated in Sanskrit as an IE. palatal; but cf. Brugmann, Gr. I², § 597, 1.

³ The final of *īrj-* is not treated in Sanskrit as an IE. palatal; historically it is considered such by Brugmann, Gr. I², § 608.

⁴ The final of *bhiṣāj-* is not treated in Sanskrit as an IE. palatal; historically it falls into this class, cf. Brugmann, Gr. I², § 597, 1.

⁵ The final of *ṛtvij-* is not treated in Sanskrit as an IE. palatal; the derivation of the word from the root *yaj-* shows the Sanskrit treatment to be un-historic.

⁶ On the rationale of generalized *k*-forms, cf. Meillet, IF. 18, 418.

(while loosening this) forming with the tip a dental stop (3), took, without change of breath or time used, a simpler course. We must remember in this connection that (as we had occasion to note in § 9) later, in historic times Sanskrit had no strictly palatal stops corresponding to *k'* or *g'*, but pronounced its "palatals" with the blade rather than the middle of the tongue. So here, the tongue, instead of forming (2) passed more directly from (1) to (3), only approximating (2) in a position (2a). This approximation (2a) produced in the voiceless group a sibilant sound, *ś* or *ṣ*. In the utterance of the voiced group, however, there was not breath enough passing through the mouth to make (2a) audible as a spirant or sibilant—(the Sanskrit could not pronounce a voiced sibilant):—(2a) formed simply a prolongation of the vowel ("compensatory lengthening").¹ In these cases the dentals (3) were pronounced farther back in the mouth than usual, becoming (as the Sanskrit made this distinction) "linguals", not dentals. That is: *-ik'ta-* > *-iṣṭa-* but *-ig'da-* > *-i... [ṣ]... ḍa-* > *-iḍa-*. The change of *a* > *ō* before dropped *ḡ* is similar to that before dropped Ar. *h* in *śaḍhi*, as in *yō dāmē* < Ar. **yah dam-* (instead of phonetic **yaz d-*). In both cases the *ō* is due to the quality of *aḥ* and *a* + spirant-position. The change to *ē* instead of *ō* in *ā-mrēdayati trṇēdhi* is probably due to the preceding *r* (*rṇ*) sound: here *a* had a value nearer *e*, as also before Ar. *z*, cf. Sk. *sēdyā-t* (Av. *hazdyā-t*). Cf. Brugmann, Gr. I², §§ 830, 8, a. 1005, 5.

A possible case of IE. *ḡq* later *k'k* shows the same treatment of *k'* as before dental, namely *śikṣa-ti* < **śiṣṭa-ti* < **k'i-ḡq-se-*; cf. above, footnote; Brugmann, Gr. I², §§ 615, 2. 829, Anm. 1; Whitney, l. c., §§ 1030, a. 1040.

Examples of the above change:

- (h) Sk. *ṣṭ* (< IE. *ḡt*): *vāṣṭi* (Gr. *ἐκών*).
 (< IE. *ḡst*): *cāṣṭē* (< IE. **queḡs-*).
 (i) Sk. —*ḍ* (< IE. *ḡd*): *mṛḍikā-m* (*r* long in RV.,
 < IE. **mṛ-ḡd-*).
 (< IE. *ḡzd*): *śōḍaś'a* (< IE. *-ḡz-de-*).

¹As to the inability of the Sanskrit to pronounce voiced sibilants, cf., aside from the historic state of the language, the treatment of IE. *z* (about which some comment will be made below), and the retention of the sibilant in Ar. *śk'* (Sk. *vr̥c̥diti*), but not in Ar. *zg'* (Sk. *mājjati*).

- (j) Sk. — *ḍh* (< IE. *ǵdh*): *ṇḍhā-s* (< IE. **ueǵh + to-*).
 (< IE. *gʷdh*): *ṣṇḍhā* (< IE. **gʷz-dh-*).

15. In the position before dentals the IE. palatals have thus coincided in Sanskrit with Ar. *š ž* (< IE. *s z* after *ī, ū, ṛ, ṛ*), as in *tiṣṭha-ti* and *miḍhā-m* (Av. *mižda-m*).

16. We have now considered the development of the IE. palatals in the following positions:

- (1) before vowels, semivowels, nasals, and *r*, to *ṣ j h* (*c*)*ch* (§ 9);
- (2) before preserved sibilants, to *k*, giving *kṣ* (§ 10);
 - (2a) final *-kṣ* becoming *-k* (§ 12),
 - (2b) or, before initial stops, *-k'* (§§ 11, 12);
- (3) before dental stops (or sibilants + dental stops), to *k' g'*, giving *k't g'd(h)* (§ 11);
 - (3a) final *-k't* becoming *-k'* (§§ 11, 13),
 - (3b) *k't* and *g'd(h)* otherwise becoming *ṣṭ* and *—ḍ(h)* (§ 14).
- (4) before velars the treatment of palatals was probably the same as before dentals (§ 14).

17. Before labial stops, where palatals were followed by closure of the lips, inaction of the tongue, and stoppage of the breath current, these sounds suffered no change, but remained as *k' g'*, the former coinciding with the *-k'* of § 12 and of § 13. Hence we may say that in all these cases the Sanskrit retained the IE. palatals until a late prehistoric time at a stage which, so far, we have represented by *k' g'*—meaning thereby to indicate stopped consonants articulated with the “middle part” of the tongue (*Zungenrücken*) against a point of the palate forward of the *k g* point, and pronounced without spirant vanish.¹

¹ By this time, needless to say, Sk. *c* and *j* from whatever source had become *t' d'*,—stops with a spirant glide, formed very near the “dental” points of tongue and palate.

In historic Sanskrit these *k' g'* sounds are uniformly represented by the so-called “cerebrals” or “linguals” written *ṭ ḍ*. Whitney, l. c., § 45, says: “The lingual mutes are by all native authorities defined as uttered with the tip of the tongue turned up and drawn back into the dome of the palate (somewhat as the usual English smooth *r* is pronounced”). They are (§ 46) “perhaps derived from the aboriginal languages of India”.

We have here most probably a case of sound substitution. It is easy to see how a people unaccustomed to hearing correctly or articulating sounds formed with the middle tongue against the dome of the palate, would substitute "linguals" for these sounds. The difference in the place of articulation would be slight if any; the change would be only in the manner: instead of bringing the dorsal surface of the tongue against the palate, the Hindu articulated with the tip. Examples:

(k) Sk. *t* (< IE. *k̂*): *viṭ-pāti-ṣ* (historic form, beside *viṣ'-pāti-ṣ*).

(< IE. *-k̂s*): *rāt̃ tatra* (< **rēks t-*).

(< IE. *-k̂st*): *avāt̃* (= *a-vāk̂ṣīt* Lat. *vexit*, formed without the connecting *ī*).

(< IE. *k̂t*): *ānat̃* (root *naṣ'-* + *t*).

(l) Sk. *ḍ* (< IE. *ǵ*) *viḍbhyās* (dat. abl. pl. of *viṣ'-*, GAv. *viṣ̌byō*).

18. The occurrence of *t̃ ḍ* for older *k̂ g'* (< *k̂ ǵ*) is strictly phonetic, then, (1) before labials (2) finally where a following *-t* or *-ṣt* have been dropped, and (3) finally where a following *-ṣ* has been dropped before initial stops. Accordingly we should inflect as follows, e. g., the noun stem *viṣ'-* (IE. *uik̂-* Av. *viṣ-*):

Nom. sg. *viṭ* (before stops, otherwise :) **vik̂*,

loc. pl. *vik̂ṣū*,

bh-cases *viḍbhyām*, *viḍbhiṣ*, *viḍbhyās*,

other cases *viṣ' am*, *viṣ' ā*, *viṣ' ī*, etc.

Most noun stems ending in IE. palatals differ from *viṣ'-* in forming the loc. pl. with analogic *t̃* for *k̂*, e. g., *-liṭsu* from *-lih-*. In the later language *viṭsu* is the loc. pl. of *viṣ'-*: the long survival of the phonetic *vik̂ṣū* being due probably to frequency of use. The complete victory of *-t̃* over *-k̂* in the nom. sg. is due mostly to the analogy of the *bh*-cases, though the occurrence of *-t̃* before initial stops no doubt gave the start. A few isolated and rare *-k̂* forms are quoted in § 12, end: these sporadic survivals in the literature may well be the reflex of a usage common in the spoken language. The forms *ṣāt̃* and *ṣāt̃su* of the numeral *ṣa(k̂)ṣ-* also show victory of the *-t̃* form.

On the other hand, the nouns named in § 12 as having *-k̂* in the nom. sg. have extended this sound to exclusive use. They

also have retained, like *viś'*, the *k*-form in the loc. pl. On the basis of these two forms they have then substituted velar forms for the *q̣* of the *bh*-cases, e. g. *dr̥gbhiṣ*. In the case of the radical noun from the root *ruj-* and of the other nouns in *-j* (< IE. *g*) mentioned in § 12, this process left no distinction between these nouns and the nouns in *-j* (< IE. *g*, *gʷ*)—whose influence of course came into play in all these cases.

In verb forms the peculiar combinations made by IE. palatals plus dental endings have helped to keep the roots in IE. palatals distinct. The roots *ruj-* and *dih-*, however, which are treated as if their finals represented IE. velars or labiovelars, are probably the victims of analogic transference, cf. the notes in § 12. On the other hand the root *bhrāj-* is treated (in its few forms, e. g., pple. *bhr̥ṣṭā-s*) as if its final were an IE. palatal; its cognates however show plainly that its final is not of this class: e. g., CSI. *obr̥zgnati*, cf. Uhlenbeck, l. c., s. v. *bhr̥jjāti*. Note also such formations as *mūḍhā-* for *mugdhā-* and finally the transference to palatal conjugation of the root *ruh-* with IE. *-dh*.

Single verb forms with *-ṭ* for *-k* or *vice versa* are also found. Thus the root aorist and *s*-aorist of roots in IE. palatals ought to form the 2d person sg. in *-k* or *-ṭ* (< older *-kš* or *-kʷš* before stops) and the 3d person sg. in *-ṭ* (< older *-kʷt* or *-kʷšt*). As a matter of fact the *-k* forms quoted in § 12, end, (*adrāk*, *asrāk*) with *nak* (from *naś'* 'attain') and *rōk* (from *ruj-*) and the *-ṭ* forms *ānaṭ* (*naś'* 'attain'), *aprāṭ*, *abhrāṭ*, *ayāṭ*, *asrāṭ* are used indifferently for the two persons. The forms *ayās* and *srās* occur twice each for the 2d person sg.; the latter form is explained by Bartholomae as belonging to a 3d sg. **srāt* with *-t* for *-ṭ* through dissimilation by the preceding *r*. *Ayās* is probably quite unphonetic: the analogic relationship is well explained by Whitney, l. c., § 555, a.

Such forms as *uḍḍhi* for **uḍhi* (< **uḡ-dhi*), imperative of *vaś'*, are formed on the model of *dug-dhi* and the like, with the feeling that *-ś'* before *-dh* as before *-bh* ought to give *-q̣*. *ṣaḍ-q̣hā* for *ṣaḍ-dhā* (< **eḡz-dh-*) are of course of similar origin.

19. To sum up, our theory of the IE. palatals in Sanskrit is as follows. IE. *ṛ̥* etc. are, in accordance with the standard view, which is based on phonetic likelihood, supposed to have been slightly palatalized velar stops.—(1) In Aryan (i. e. before the palatalization of IE. velars and labiovelars and before the subsequent change of IE. *ṛ̥*, *ṝ̥* > *ā*) there were two dialects: the

Iranian with strong spirant tendency, which developed IE. \hat{k} etc. so rapidly that the new Ar. palatals could not coincide with them; and the Indic which spirantized \hat{k} etc. less rapidly, so that, while IE. \hat{k} never coincided with the new Ar. palatals, IE. \hat{g} and $\hat{g}h$ did. Before vowels, semivowels, nasals, and r IE. \hat{k} \hat{g} $\hat{g}h$ became Sanskrit \check{s} j h .—Before stops and sibilants they at first remained k' g' . After the dropping of sibilants between stops, $k's$ became Sanskrit $k\check{s}$.—The simplification of final consonant groups reduced $-k\check{s}$ to Sanskrit $-k$ and $-k't$ to $-k'$.—Now $k't$ everywhere became $\check{s}t$ and $g'd(h)$ everywhere became $-d(h)$.—(2) Finally k' and g' (which now remained only in final position and before labial stops) became t and d .

20. Having constructed our edifice we must now defend it. The two points most liable to objection from the viewpoint of the current theory are above marked as (1) and (2). We shall now consider these points.

21. As to point (1), we must observe that we have determined no anterior limit, chronologically, to the state of things there described. The "dialectic" difference between Iranian and Indic in the treatment of the IE. palatals may date back—and probably does date back—to the time when the IE. dialects first began to diverge in their pronunciation of these sounds.

The objection to (1) then will be: How is it possible that of the Aryan sister languages, which long formed a unit, making in common many changes of pronunciation, flexion, use of forms, vocabulary, etc., one should be a thorough-going *satəm* language, the other far from that and almost a *centum* language?

We may answer that this is not only possible, but that this our view is decidedly in accordance with the results of modern investigation. When we say that Iranian and Indic in common changed IE. \check{z} , $\check{\delta}$ to \check{d} , but even before that time—and indeed from the Indo-European time—diverged in the pronunciation of the IE. palatals, we are only implying that two successive sound changes, though in part coinciding as to territory, may be topographically of different extent. Iranian and Indic were mutually intelligible dialects in Aryan times, although the old *centum-satəm* sound change had left some difference between them. So the Italic, for instance, agrees in a number of developments with the Celtic and in a number with the Greek. *A priori* it is, in fact, much more likely that one of the so-called *satəm* languages should differ somewhat from the others in its treatment of the

palatals, than that the eastern languages and the western languages should be cut apart like two halves of a cheese.

Such a division as that between *centum* and *satem* languages has value only as a description or classification of actual facts. As the Sanskrit does not actually represent the IE. palatals by sibilants, but only partly so and mostly by palatal, velar, and lingual stops, the burden of proof rests entirely on those who wish to class Sanskrit with the sibilant languages and insist that the Sanskrit sibilants are hidden behind the historic Sanskrit stops.

22. This brings us to the second point of objection. We have supposed that in certain positions the IE. palatals remained palatalized velar stops in Indic until shortly before the historic time, when they were changed to the Sanskrit lingual stops. In other words, we assumed a sound substitution $k' g' > t q$ where the current view supposes a development of $k' g' > \text{ʃ ʒ} > t q$. Aside from the methodic consideration that it is unnecessary to suppose such a roundabout development as the latter, our chief argument was that a development from ʃ ʒ to $t q$, or in general from sibilants to stops is improbable and unparalleled.

The objection may be urged, now, that this development is paralleled in Sanskrit, that the IE. sibilants in Sanskrit sometimes appear as lingual and as dental stops. Let us consider these phenomena and attempt to divine their meaning.¹

We must note, first, that the actual representation of IE. sibilants and of IE. palatals does in one set of cases universally coincide: namely, the IE. palatals before dental stops coincide with Ar. š ž in the same position (cf. § 15).

Secondly we must note that the following representations of IE. sibilants as stops are rare in the older language. If in some cases the analogies involved seem indirect, we must remember that they were not made any oftener than this would lead us to expect. The representations in question become regular only after the grammarians, who naturally were struck by what seemed to them decided and peculiar sound-changes, prescribed them as correct.

¹ To avoid constant reference to the divergent view we may here refer to Brugmann's *Grundriss* I², §§ 819–830, 1005, 5, 1007, 11. Examples are taken from Brugmann and from Whitney, l. c., §§ 164–168, b. 172, 172, a. 225–226, f. 612, b. 617, b. 620, b.

Thus when we find a few cases in the older language of \check{s} before s in inflection "becoming" k , so as to give $k\check{s}$, the explanation is obvious:— $vā\check{s}ti$: $vāk\check{s}i$ = $vivē\check{s}ti$: $vivēk\check{s}i$. Similarly, Vedic 2d and 3d sg. $pīṇak$ as if from a palatal root.

So obvious is this explanation that even some advocates of the prevalent view have decided to adopt it, although giving up the change $\check{s} > k$ forces the corollary that IE. \hat{k} \hat{g} before sibilants at least never quite became sibilants, but were "Ar. χ γ ".

The second supposed change of sibilants to stops is that to linguals. Final $-\check{s}$ (IE. $-s$ + $-s$ of nom. sg. or $-s$, $-t$ as verb endings) appears in a few old cases as $-t$. Later this is considered regular, and the final $-\check{s}$ of radical noun stems appears as $-t$ $-q$ also before the endings $-su$ and $-bh$, e. g. $dvi\check{s}am$, $dvi\check{t}$, $dvi\check{t}su$, $dviqbhi\check{s}$; imperfect tense: $advē\check{s}am$, $advē\check{t}$, $advē\check{t}$.

The standard view wisely leaves $dvi\check{t}$, $advē\check{t}$ out of play; $dvi\check{t}su$ is allowed to be unoriginal; but $dviqbhi\check{s}$ is considered the regular phonetic development of $*dvi\check{s}-bhi\check{s}$. From this $dvi\check{t}$, etc., developed.

The facts of the language are decidedly against this view. The prefix $du\check{s}$ - nowhere changes its final to a stop, lingual or other; similarly the adverb $saj\check{t}u\check{s}$. The change of $-\check{s}$ to t q occurs "only once in RV. and once in AV. ($-dvi\check{t}$ and $-pru\check{t}$), although those texts have more than 40 roots with final $-\check{s}$; in the Brāhmaṇas, moreover, have been noticed further only $-pru\check{t}$ and $vi\check{t}$ ŚB.), and $-ś'li\check{t}$ (K.)". On the other hand we still meet in RV. $vivē\check{s}$ and $ā-vivē\check{s}$ from $vi\check{s}$ - and perhaps a few other cases, cf. Whitney, l. c., §§ 225, a. 226, d. Even in the later language most cases of final $-\check{s}$ fall into the class of $havi\check{s}$ - ($havi\check{r}$ $āsti$, $havi\check{s}$ $tī\check{s}thati$, etc., $havi\check{r}bhi\check{s}$, $havi\check{s}ṣu$ or $havi\check{h}ṣu$). Our judgment has been too much under the spell of the traditional descriptive grammar, which naturally emphasizes the most striking changes. It was the similarity of $vā\check{s}ti$ to $dvē\check{s}ti$ (and later of $vāk\check{s}i$ to $dvēk\check{s}i$) that caused $advē\check{t}$ to be formed like $āva\check{t}$. In the case of the nouns the necessity was felt that a root noun, in the nom. sg., before $-bh$, and before $-su$, had to have a stop. Owing to forms like $advē\check{t}$ the stop thought of was the lingual. Otherwise expressed: as \check{s}' gave in various connections $\check{s}t$, $k\check{s}$, t , ts , qbh , \check{s} , which also gave $\check{s}t$ was made to give $k\check{s}$, and later t , ts , qbh . Note further such parallels as $lēk\check{s}i$ with the new $dvēk\check{s}i$ and $āhṇhvam$ with (s -aor.) $astōḍhvam$. When the feeling had

arisen that the stop form of \check{s} was $t\ d$, forms like *dvidḍhi* and forms and spellings like *dvidḍhvam* arose, cf. *udḍhi*, § 18, end, and Brugmann, Gr. I², § 830, Anm. 2.

23. Parallel to forms with $k\check{s}$ from roots in $-\check{s}$ are a few forms with ts from roots with $-s$, as fut. *vatsyāmi* from *vas-*, desid. *jighatsa* from *ghas-*. The regular treatment would have given **vassyāmi*, etc., or **vahsyāmi*, etc. (similarly pronounced), which were not felt as s -forms; hence imitation of the nearest lying combination of stops + s , as in *patsyāmi*. There is no need of any such far-fetched explanation as change of s to t before s , or development of a stop within ss .

Again, parallel to the supposed change of $-\check{s}$ to $-t\ d$ a change of $-s$ to $-d$ is considered phonetic in the Vedic *mādbhiḥ*, etc., from *mās-* and *uṣādbhiḥ* from *uṣās-*; but there is no reason for abandoning Whitney's explanation of these forms as substitution of t -stem forms for s -stem forms. Whitney adduces the parallel case of the perf. act. pple.; and, in general, inflection from several stems is so characteristic of the older stages of IE. languages that these ancient and rare forms also are best looked upon as survivals. Cf. for the rest Goth. *mēnōps* and the relation Sk. *yākṛt*, *yakn-ās* : Lat. *jec-in-or-is*.

There is further one word stem in which IE. z is said to have given Sk. d : *madgūṣ-*, cf. Lat. *mergus*, which belong to Sk. *mājja-ti*, Lith. *mazgōti*. First note that the jj in *mājja-ti* is pronounced $d'd'$ (with a slight glide), cf. $jj < d + j$ in *taj jalām*. This $d'd'$ is, as we have seen, parallel to $(c)ch$ (the first c serves, of course, only to indicate that ch is a double consonant, not a mere aspirate), except that in this combination, pronounced $t's'$, the s' corresponds to the second d' of the voiced combination, where sibilant could not be pronounced. Just as $sk' (= s\hat{k}) > s'k'h > s'k'\chi' > s't's' > t's'$, so in the voiced combination zg' , with slower development, $zg' > z'g'h >$ (some such thing as) $d'y' > d'd'$. Now the noun **mazgu-* regularly $> *mēgu-$, for which *madgū-* was formed from *mājja-ti* just as *tād gācchati* corresponds to *taj jagāma* or, practically, as *tyāgā-s* corresponds to *tyājati*.

Thus it appears that the alleged developments of sibilants to Sanskrit stops are in no case instances of phonetic change.

NOTE on the IE. "sonant aspirates". In the above discussion the treatment of IE, $\bar{g}h$ was brought up as little as possible,

owing to the uncertainty which surrounds the nature of the IE. "sonant aspirates". We shall here recall a few of the properties of these sounds as indicated by their development in the various IE. languages and then show that our view of the development of the IE. palatals in Sanskrit is consistent with the development of IE. *ǵh* to voiced *h*.

(1) The stop element in the IE. "voiced aspirates" was voiced, as a preceding voiceless stop is assimilated. The second element or "aspiration" cannot be pronounced before an immediately following stop, but is left until the stop or stops have been articulated, and is then uttered: in the meantime the glottis is not opened, i. e., the voice continues, as in "assimilation" of surds to sonants,—showing the "aspiration" to have been a voiced sound. In Sanskrit when the stop element is absent the sound uttered is a "voiced *h*" (*stimmhafter Hauch*). We may, then, provisionally ascribe to the "sonant aspirates" the value of a stop closely followed by a voiced breathing—a volume of breath being sent through the open mouth sufficient to be audible as an aspiration (*Hauch*), but not sufficient to necessitate greater opening of the glottis than is consistent with voicing.

(2) The inherent difficulty of pronouncing these sounds is due to the general fact that a delicately graded or "halfway" muscular movement is harder to make than a decided or "all the way" one. Hence the instability of these sounds. They are preserved only in the highly conservative and ancient Sanskrit. In Germanic they were preserved up to the time of the sound-shifting, when they were changed by the strong breath stress, which probably assimilated the stop element to the succeeding spirant element. Sanskrit and Germanic alone kept the "sonant aspirates" apart from the other classes of stops.¹

(3) In Greek and Italic a total opening of the glottis was substituted for the delicately graded opening with voice continuation. Thus the aspiration became voiceless and the stop was assimilated to it. Similar is the result when an English-speaking person first tries to pronounce a "sonant aspirate" as above described, or a Čechish voiced *h*.

(4) The other IE. languages substituted ordinary vibration of the vocal chords for the period of more open vibration: or, from

¹ This conservative phonetic character of Germanic among the IE. languages is general, cf. a forthcoming paper by Dr. E. Prokosch.

another point of view, they assimilated the voiced aspiration to the following action of the vocal chords.

(5) The difficulty of pronouncing these sounds affects even Sanskrit. In the passage from vowel to stop to "breathing" the (lip or) tongue had to make its stop articulation rapidly: and this rapid action had to be made most rapidly exactly where it is most difficult, in the back of the mouth. Hence we find *h* for *bh* less frequently than *h* for *dh*; and, could we distinguish the cases of *h* for *gh* from those of *h* for (historic or analogic) *g'h*, there is no doubt that we should find them more numerous than the preceding. In the case of *g'h* (< IE. *ǵh* and Ar. *g'h*) the difficulty of pronunciation was by far greatest, as the middle tongue had to be raised to the highest part of the palate—an articulation nowhere retained in Sanskrit. Hence we find here universal loss of the stop and retention of voiced *h*.

LEONARD BLOOMFIELD.

III.—THE INTRODUCTION OF MASKS ON THE ROMAN STAGE.¹

If ancient testimony concerning the introduction of masks on the Roman stage were as consistent as it is abundant, one of the troublesome problems in the history of the Roman theater would never have arisen. The passage most often quoted on the subject is from Diomedes² (Keil, Gramm. Lat., I. 489): *antea itaque galearibus, non personis utebantur, ut qualitas coloris indicium faceret aetatis, cum essent albi aut nigri aut rufi. Personis vero uti primus coepit Roscius Gallus, praecipuus histrio, quod oculis perversis³ erat nec satis decorus in personis⁴ nisi parasitus pronuntiabat.* The uncertainties of the text in this passage seem not to affect the plain statement that Roscius was the first to begin the use of masks among the Romans.⁵ It is, therefore,

¹ In a recent attempt to bring together all the available evidence concerning Costume in Roman Comedy (Columbia University Press, 1909) I was obliged by the large amount of material involved to omit a discussion of the use of masks. From time to time various phases of this question have been treated in special papers and dissertations, but a convenient and complete summary of the present status of the question I have been unable to discover, even in van Wageningen, *Scaenica Romana* (Groningen, 1907). Such a summary I have attempted to give in this paper, with appropriate comment.

² Diomedes's sources seem to have been Suetonius and Varro (see Teuffel-Schwabe, *Röm. Lit.*, I⁵. 29; Ribbeck, *Röm. Trag.* 661). Cf. the parallel passages in Suetonius (Reifferscheid, *Reliquiae*, p. 11): both Suetonius and Diomedes quote Varro in their discussion of *comoedia*, of which these two passages form a part.

³ *Eversis* A B M, *obversis* S: *perversis* scripsit Keilius ex Cic. de Nat. Deor. I 28. 79 at erat (Roscius), sicut hodie est, oculis perversissimis.

⁴ *Nec satis decorus nisi personatus* coniecit Reuversius Collect. Litt. p. 10 *sine personis* Langius Vind. Trag. Rom. p. 43. Hofferus (De Personarum Usu in Comoediis Terenti, p. 10) *sine personis* legit, Suetonium (l. c.) secutus. *Nisi* om. M.

⁵ At least, no such uncertainty is indicated by Keil. However, Naumann says (De Personarum Usu in Terentii Comoediis, p. 3): *Sed quoniam totus ille locus (i. e., apud Diomedem) in codicibus misere corruptus est, quam errorem a Diomede ad Suetonium a Suetonio ad Varronem referre hominemque doctissimum et diligentissimum manifestae insimulare negligentiae, multo*

most natural to expect further evidence on the subject from the actor's distinguished pupil, Cicero, and scholars have collected from the orator's works at least four passages which bear more or less directly on the matter.

In *De Oratore* 3. 59. 221 Crassus is made to say: *sed in ore sunt omnia. In eo autem ipso dominatus est omnis oculorum: quo melius nostri illi senes, qui personatum ne Roscium quidem magno opere laudabant.* That is, Crassus, speaking in 91 B. C., refers to the old men of the time as having refused to approve even Roscius, when he acted *personatus*. It seems a fair inference that to these disapproving *senes* the use of masks was an innovation: but as Naumann speedily pointed out (l. c., p. 2), by no means inevitable is Hoffer's further inference (l. c., pp. 4-7) that this unpopular innovation had crystallized into uniform practice by 91 B. C. or even by 55 B. C. (the probable date of the composition of the *De Oratore*). However, in confirmation of this view, Hoffer proceeds to cite another passage from the *De Oratore* (2. 46. 193), where Cicero warns the orator that he must himself feel the emotion which he desires to excite: *Sed, ut dixi, ne hoc in nobis <= nobis oratoribus> mirum videatur, quid potest esse tam fictum quam versus, quam scaena, quam fabulae? Tamen in hoc genere saepe ipse vidi ut ex persona mihi ardere oculi hominis histrionis viderentur, etc.* Again, the inference that the use of the mask was uniform when these words were written is tempting but unjustifiable.¹ Even less satisfactory for Hoffer's purpose are the words in *De Div.* 1. 37. 80: *Quid vestra oratio in*

probabilius est inter coepit et Roscius olim Minucium Prothymum et Cincium Faliscum, quos Donatus de Com. extr. primos tradit fabulas personatos egisse, fuisse nominatos Naumann seems here to have confused the passage from Diomedes with the parallel passage from Suetonius, the latter of which is preceded and followed by lacunae.

¹ It may further be objected that this passage, as, probably, the next (*De Div.* 1. 37. 80) also, has reference to tragedy and not to comedy. From the available evidence it seems impossible to say whether masks were introduced earlier at Rome on the comic or on the tragic stage. Ribbeck argues (*Röm. Trag.* 660-662; 672) that masks were first used on the tragic stage, but he has probably misinterpreted his evidence in this respect (see below p. 61, especially n. 6). In the *Festus* passage discussed below, pp. 64-5, *comoedi* are mentioned before *tragoedi* and in Euanthius (*De Com.* VI. 3) comedy is mentioned before tragedy: but that order is perhaps not significant, especially since it is probable that in the Euanthius passage the names of the innovators have been reversed.

causis? quid ipsa actio? potest esse vehemens, et gravis, et copiosa, nisi est animus ipse commotior? Equidem etiam in te saepe vidi et (ut ad leviora veniamus) in Aesopo familiari tuo tantum ardorem vultuum atque motuum, ut eum vis quaedam abstraxisse a sensu mentis videretur. Now, this passage is generally cited to show that the use of masks was *not* constant in Cicero's time, but Hoffer disposes of the obvious difficulty by suggesting (1) that Aesopus's mask might have been so constructed as to depict his excited mental state, *vultus* thus being used in a transferred sense, or (2) that Quintus, having in mind at the outset not so much the actor's as the orator's action, suddenly turns the course of his thought aside to Aesopus and applies to the actor what he had intended to apply only to Cicero.

The fourth and last of the important passages from Cicero is to be found in *De Nat. Deor.* i. 28. 79: Q. Catulus, huius collegae et familiaris nostri pater, dilexit municipem tuum Roscium; in quem etiam illud est eius

Constiteram exorientem Auroram forte salutans
Cum subito a laeva Roscius exoritur.
Pace mihi liceat, caelestes, dicere vestra;
Mortalis visust pulchrior esse deo.

Huic deo pulchrior: at erat, sicuti hodie est, perversissimis oculis. Quid refert, si hoc ipsum salsum illi et venustum videbatur? The assumption that Roscius is here described as acting on the stage seems to me to be unwarranted,¹ but Hoffer so interprets the situation,² and concludes that when this epigram was written Roscius could not have adopted the habit of playing *personatus*; furthermore, the generation of the elder Catulus³ would fit in well with that of the disapproving *senes* in *De Orat.* 3. 59. 221.

If our evidence stopped here with the testimony of Cicero, Suetonius and Diomedes, we might regret its incompleteness, but, at least we should not be troubled by any glaring incon-

¹ There is a bare possibility that Roscius, if not here represented as acting on the stage, is practising without a mask for the stage, since he is cited by Valerius Maximus (8. 7. 7) as one of the great men of history who were examples of *studium* and *industria*, inasmuch as he employed no gesture in public performances which he had not practised at home.

² This view seems probable to Ribbeck also: see *Röm. Trag.* 671, n. 136.

³ This Catulus died in the Marian proscription in 87 B. C.

sistency. However, quite as positive as the statements which Suetonius and Diomedes make concerning Roscius are three other statements of Donatus and Euanthius, which not only contradict the assertion of Suetonius and Diomedes but even disagree among themselves.¹ The first comes from the *locus classicus* of our knowledge of Roman stage presentations, Euanthius de Comoedia (VI. 3): Personati primi egisse dicuntur comoediam Cincius Faliscus, tragoediam Minucius Prothymus. The second is from Donatus, Praef. ad Eun. 6: Acta plane est ludis Megalensibus L. Postumio L. Cornelio aedilibus curulibus,² agentibus etiam tunc personatis L. Minucio Prothymo L. Ambivio Turpione, item modulante Flacco Claudi tibiis dextra et sinistra ob iocularia multa permixta gravitati. The third passage is from another Praefatio of Donatus—that of the Adelphoe (6): haec sane acta est ludis scaenicis funebribus L. Aemili Pauli³ agentibus L. Ambivio et L. <Minucio Prothymo>,⁴ qui cum suis gregibus etiam tum personati agebant.

In the first passage (Euanthius de Com. VI. 3) the writer seems to have reversed the provinces of Cincius Faliscus and Minucius Prothymus, for the second passage and probably the third also associate the latter with comedy.⁵ The connection of Minucius Prothymus with the introduction of masks Ribbeck (Röm. Trag., 660-661) proposed to reconcile with Diomedes's statement by suggesting that Minucius Prothymus may have been the stage-manager under whom Roscius first acted *personatus*.⁶ Such a supposition seemed not impossible, for Dziatzko

¹ If all attempts to reconcile the testimony of Donatus and Euanthius with that of Cicero, Suetonius and Diomedes prove unsuccessful, the latter should certainly have the greater claim on our confidence, especially if Diomedes and Suetonius go back ultimately to Varro (cf. above, p. 58, n. 2). See, however, van Wageningen, *Scaenica Romana*, p. 35: Nobis difficile est hanc solvere quaestionem atque diiudicare utri maior fides habenda sit, Diomedem an Donato, quod uterque locuples auctor est.

² In 161 B. C.

³ In 160 B. C.

⁴ *Minucio Prothymo* supplavit Wilmanns: * * * * V, om. A C.

⁵ See Schanz, *Röm. Literaturgesch.*,³ Müller's Hdb. VIII. I. 1, 200 (1906), and van Wageningen, *Scaenica Romana*, pp. 34-35.

⁶ It was, however, in Ribbeck's opinion the *tragic* stage on which Roscius and Minucius Prothymus introduced the use of masks. His authority seems to be, apart from the passage above cited from Euanthius (De Com. VI. 3), the tradition that Roscius, though especially fine in comedy, was also a successful actor of tragedy (Röm. Trag., 661 ff.; 108). But his great per-

had shown that Minucius Prothymus brought out the Adelphoe in post-Terentian times (Rh. Mus. 20. 589, 591) and Ribbeck (Röm. Trag., 661) regards Minucius Prothymus as belonging most probably to the period of Accius.¹ If we grant this date for Minucius Prothymus, the only other difficulty with Ribbeck's explanation is that it seems to leave unaccounted for the mention of Ambivius Turpio, which Donatus makes in both the Praefationes above quoted; but this difficulty is obviated, if, again, we agree with Dziatzko (Rh. Mus. 21. 68, 82) that the three actors mentioned in connection with each play in the Donatus Praefationes and in the Terentian Didascaliae² had to do with *different* presentations of the respective plays. Hoffer suggests that in the beginning the introduction of masks was probably assigned to Minucius Prothymus alone and only later to Ambivius Turpio, when the names of the successive managers had been confused in Praefationes and Didascaliae.³ He adds, as further evidence that Ambivius Turpio could hardly have employed masks, the words from Cicero De Sen. 48⁴ to the effect that Ambivius especially delighted the spectators *in prima cavea*, a thing which Hoffer regards as very unlikely, in the light of De Orat. 3. 59. 221, if Ambivius Turpio had played *personatus*. But here, again, Hoffer is interpreting the text arbitrarily to suit his purpose, for the delight of the audience *in prima cavea* may have been due simply to *hearing* Roscius better; or, if the

eminence in comedy (see Quint. 11. 1. 3.), along with the distinct mention of the rôle of the parasite, seems to indicate that comedy was certainly not *less* in the mind of Diomedes than was tragedy. See above, p. 59, n. 1.

¹ Leo, speaking of Atilius Praenestinus as the probable successor of L. Ambivius Turpio in the production of Terence's plays (Rh. Mus. 38, 242), adds: "Dass Minucius Prothymus jünger war ist eine durchaus gerechtfertigte Annahme".

² Egere L. Ambivius Turpio L. Atilius Praen.—Didascalia Eunuchi Egere L. Atilius Praen. L. Ambivius Turpio.—Didascalia Adelphorum.

³ Similar is the view of Leo (Rh. Mus. 38. 343), though his grounds are different; "Mir will scheinen, dass Donat sich durch sein 'etiam tum' selbst verräth. Ihm ist das richtige bekannt, aber er fühlt sich durch irgend einen andern Umstand zu einem trügerischen Schluss veranlasst. So ist die Antwort gegeben: Donat kannte die Scenenbilder, in denen die Schauspieler maskirt dargestellt u. denen die Maskengruppen vorausgeschickt sind, er schloss aus den Illustrationen auf die Zeit des Dichters".

⁴ Turpione Ambivio magis delectatur qui in prima cavea spectat, delectatur tamen etiam qui in ultima The date of this dialogue is supposed to be 150 B. C.

literal meaning of *spectat* is insisted upon, it may have been merely his gestures and general bearing which they delighted to watch and not necessarily his facial expression (cf. *De Orat.* i. 59. 251).

Ribbeck's attempt to reconcile the introduction of masks by Roscius with Donatus's statements about Minucius Prothymus had apparently been generally accepted as the best explanation available until recently, when van Wageningen (*Scaenica Romana*, pp. 35-41) protested against the idea that these actors were contemporaries. His argument runs as follows: Ambivius Turpio was an old man in 160 B. C., when he spoke the prologue of the *Hecyra*,¹ though he was still acting most acceptably to his audiences in 150 B. C.² Supposing him to have died shortly after this and Atilius Praenestinus, his successor in presenting Terence's plays, to have flourished about twenty years (150 B. C.—130 B. C.), Minucius Prothymus, who succeeded Atilius, ought probably to be assigned to the years 130–110 B. C. Now, the *senes* to whom Crassus refers in 91 B. C. probably saw players acting without masks about forty years before,³ i. e. in the neighborhood of 131 B. C., which would easily allow the introduction of masks to fall into the period assumed for Minucius Prothymus (130–110 B. C.). But Roscius, who died a *senex* in 63 or 62 B. C.,⁴ was probably born about 135 B. C., in which case he could hardly have made any great innovation on the stage before 115 B. C. Even if we grant this chronology of van Wageningen, which is almost pure speculation, it does not make impossible Ribbeck's theory that Roscius may have been, for a time at least, in the *grex* of Minucius Prothymus; but van Wageningen believes that there is ground to suppose that Minucius Prothymus introduced masks at Rome much earlier than 115 B. C.—viz. about 130 B. C. He bases his opinion on a passage from Tacitus (*Ann.* 14. 21),⁵ where it is said that the *ludi* were especially elaborate

¹ Orator ad vos venio ornatu prologi:

sinite exorator sim, eodem ut iure uti *senem*
liceat, quo iure sum usus adulescentior.

—Hec. Prol. 9-11.

² See p. 62, n. 4.

³ See below, p. 71, n. 2.

⁴ Cic. *Pro Archia*, 17.

⁵ *Maiores quoque non abhorruisse spectaculorum oblectamentis pro fortuna quae tum erat, eoque a Tuscis accitos histriones, a Thuriis equorum certamina: et possessa Achaia Asiaque ludos curatius editos, nec quemquam*

after the conquests of Achaia (146 B. C.) and of Asia (130 B. C.), theatrical representations being expressly mentioned in connection with the brilliant triumph of L. Mummius in 145 B. C. Along with the plunder brought from the East after these conquests were numerous slaves, many of whom were not improbably actors. And so van Wageningen suggests that Minucius Prothymus, with his Greek *cognomen* and his possible floruit of 130-110 B. C., was the *Greek manager* who attempted to introduce masks at Rome, but that not until a *Roman actor*, Roscius, adopted the custom was it really accepted by the Romans, in whose minds, therefore, Roscius stood as the real innovator.

There remains to be considered one other general statement by Donatus—a comment on *Andria* IV. 3. 1: *haec scaena administrationem doli habet, quo fit ut deterreatur Chremes filiam suam Pamphilo dare. Et vide non minimas partes in hac comoedia Mysidi attribui, hoc est personae femineae, sive haec personatis viris agitur, ut apud veteres, sive per mulierem, ut nunc videmus.* The evidence to be derived from this passage depends, of course, on the interpretation of *apud veteres*, a phrase which Hoffer says (p. 32), judging from its use in other Donatus passages, may refer to any period before the time of Augustus. It is also true that Tacitus (*Dial.* 15-19) and Quintilian (9. 3. 1) use *veteres* and *antiqui* in opposition to *nostri* (contemporaneous writers), much as we set 'classical' or 'ante-classical' over against 'post-classical'.¹ Hence, the comment of Donatus avails equally little for those who claim, with Hoffer, that masks were introduced between the time of Terence and that of Cicero, and for those who think that even in Plautus's day masks were used by men when they played women's parts. The scales might be turned in favor of the later date by a passage from Festus, if only we could trust Mueller's reading² but the *quaedam Naevi* of

Romae honesto loco ortum ad theatrales artes degeneravisse, ducentis iam annis a L. Mummii triumpho qui primus id genus spectaculi in urbe prae-buerit. Sed et consultum parsimoniae quod perpetua sedes theatro locata sit potius quam immenso sumptu singulos per annos consurgeret ac destrueretur.

¹ See Archaism in Aulus Gellius, by Professor Charles Knapp, *Drisler Studies*, pp. 129-132.

² *Personata fabula quaedam Naevi inscribitur, quam putant quidam primum a personatis histrionibus. sed cum post multos annos comedi et tragoedi personis uti coeperunt, verisimilius est eam fabulam propter inopiam comedorum actam novam pe² Atellanos, qui proprie vocantur personati, quia ius*

Mueller's text is so far uncertain that Thewrewk de Ponor reads merely *quaedam ne ut*¹ (*Personata fabula quaedam ne ut in-scribitur, quam putant quidam primum† a personatis histrionibus*).

In view of the uncertain results yielded by all the passages which we have thus far considered, Hoffer set to work to examine the Donatus commentary in detail, collecting from it eighty passages (l. c., pp. 23-30) which seemed to him to show that a change of facial expression was being suggested by the scholiast. There is, however, grave question as to the value of some of these passages for Hoffer's argument. Thus, the literal meaning of *vultuose* can hardly be pressed in view of comments like that on And. I. 2. 13 (more *servili et vernili gestu: sic enim vocati a dominis secum vultuose agunt*) or that on And. II. 1. 32 (*interposita distinctione vultuose hoc dicitur, hoc est cum gestu*).² On the other hand, it must be conceded that a very large number of the passages, if taken quite simply and naturally, seem to imply unimpeded facial expression: cf., e. g., the comment on *nihil quidem* (Eun. II. 2. 42), *dicens 'nihil' mutavit vultum Parmeno in laetitiam*; on Eun. V. 8. 7, *hoc vultu mutato et conturbato dicitur*; on Hec. IV. 4. 103, *melius pronuntiaveris si renitente et improbante hoc vultu dicere acceperis Philippum, quasi non oporteat interesse socerum*. Whether these scholia are of sufficiently early origin to furnish evidence for the theater of the Republican period is, of course, a moot question. At one ex-

est is non cogi in scaena ponere personam, quod ceteris histrionibus pati necesse est. So Mueller's Festus, p. 217 a. In l. 1 Mueller would insert *actam* after *primum*, and in l. 2 *acta sit quam* after *annos*. Better than Mueller's *acta sit quam* seems to be the simple change of *coeperunt* to *coeperint* which Hoffer (l. c., p. 18) suggests. The passage is thus interpreted by Munk, *De Fabulis Atellanis*, p. 70: "Festi sententia quam sane paulo negligentius expressit sive potius excerpsit haec est. Naeviana quaedam fabula personata dicta est, quia ab Atellanis est acta; Atellani vero Naevii tempore personati dicti sunt, quia tum soli personis utebantur: nunc vero etiam i. e. eo tempore quo Verrius Flaccus vixit sive quem alium exscripsit Festus, proprie personati vocantur, licet ceteri quoque histriones personati prodeant, quia ius est iis non cogi personam ponere quod ceteris histrionibus pati necesse est".

¹ See also Keil, *Rh. Mus.* VI. 616.

² Wessner prints *hoc est cum gestu* in italics. In his Praefatio, p. xlvii, he says: "Inclinatis autem litteris reddi ea imprimis volui, quibus integrum scholium in duas vel plures partes disiectum esse videbatur: hic illic etiam parva additamenta (cf. And. prol. 6²; 16³; 24²; 25³; I. 1. 1⁶; 2¹; al.) eodem typorum genere exprimenda curavi".

treme stands Sittl who holds that the commentator is not writing for actors at all but for the students of rhetoric and the professional declaimers of his own day,¹ at the other extreme that whole school of Donatus critics from Schopen down who believe that the Donatus scholia on scenic action do really go back to an early source.²

Of the available literary evidence it only remains to examine the extant comedies themselves in the light of two questions: (1) Are there any situations in the comedies of Plautus and Terence which demand the use of masks? (2) Are there any situations in those comedies which indicate that Plautus and Terence intended them to be acted without masks?

To the first question we may answer unqualifiedly "No". That women's parts were from the first taken by masked men used to be held³ on the authority of the Donatus passage (ad And. IV. 3. 1) above discussed. Similarly, before the dissertation of Hoffer (see p. 1, n. 4) it seems to have been commonly believed that masks were used for those rôles on the confusion of which the point of a play turned, e. g., for the two brothers in the *Menaechmi* and for Jupiter and Amphitruo, Mercury and Sosia in the *Amphitruo*. That such pairs of actors may have worn masks is, of course, possible: that it actually was the case

¹"Was von ihm selbst (i. e. Donatus) herrührt, hat für die Bühnenalterthümer keinen Wert, weil zu seiner Zeit längst keine Terenzische Komödien mehr aufgeführt wurden. Daraus ist nun nicht der weitere Schluss zu ziehen, die Gestenscholia müssten alt sein: denn der Terenzcommentar zielt augenscheinlich auf den rhetorischen Unterricht ab. Nun werden wir bald zeigen, dass auch bei der privaten Deklamation die Mimik nicht fehlte. Donat schreibt also weder für Schauspieler noch nach Komikern, sondern als öffentlicher Professor der Rhetorik, weshalb er auch über die Miene Vorschriften giebt, welche doch für die maskentragenden Schauspieler keinen Wert hatten". So Sittl, *Die Gebärden der Griechen u. Römer*, 203.

²The scenic character of a large part of the Donatus scholia is defended by Dr. J. W. Basore in a Johns Hopkins University dissertation entitled *The Scholia on Hypokrisis in the Commentary of Donatus* (Baltimore, 1908), pp. 4-10.

³See, e. g., Lorenz, *Most. Einl.* 15, and Wagner, *Hauton* (Berlin, 1892), *Einl.* 16. This view is repudiated by Lorenz in his second edition of the *Mostellaria* (1883), *Einl.* 6, *Krit. Anm.* 196: van Wageningen in his chapter *De Personis sive Larvis* (*Scaenica Romana*, p. 34) says: "De feminis nihil constat, sed verisimile est actores, qui olim partes muliebres agebant, facie fucata, capillis cultioribus (δγκφ), manibus gypsatis in scaenam prodisse (cf. Varro, *Eumenides fr. XLIII*: Cic. ad Fam. 7. 6. 1).

is improbable, if all the other actors in the piece played without masks: for, granted a somewhat close resemblance of form and feature in the two actors playing such rôles, masks were certainly not a necessity to the ancients, who evidently knew the use of a large number of cosmetics (cf. Lorenz's note on *Most.* 264).¹ Witness also the modern stage-conventions in a play like the *Comedy of Errors*, of which the *Menaechmi* is the prototype. There are numerous other cases in Roman Comedy in which the disguise is an important factor in the plot, but often no very close resemblance between the counterfeiter and the counterfeited is necessary, for neither is actually known to the person to be deceived. Thus, (a) in the *Asinaria*, Leonida Servus pretends to the strange Mercator to be Saurea Atriensis, but neither Leonida nor Saurea is personally known to the Mercator; (b) in the *Captivi*, both master and slave are strangers to their captors so that neither captive's face would reveal his real identity; (c) in the *Curculio*, the parasite pretends to be Summanus, the freedman of Therapontigonus Miles, but he is a stranger, and needs nothing to conceal his face. More difficult, if indeed we admit any difficulty at all in effecting disguises without masks, are cases like the following: (1) in the *Casina*, a man, an *armiger*, disguised as a woman, *Casina*, is to be given in marriage to the *vilicus*: (2) in the *Persa*, Sagaristio Servus is disguised as a *peregrinus* and brings in the *Virgo* disguised as a *Persa*. In these cases, however, the disguise was, of course, helped out by the more voluminous robes worn by women and Orientals.

The word *persona* occurs in the *Persa* (783) and in *Eunuchus* Prol. 26, 32, 35; but in the Terentian passages it evidently means 'rôle', 'character', and in the Plautus passage² merely

¹ That the audience was not very exacting in some details of stage-convention may be inferred from situations like that in the *Menaechmi*, where, in order to make the confusion of the two brothers possible, we must assume (1) that the travelling Menaechmus did not wear *vestis peregrina* at all (though he had *pedisequi* and baggage), or (2) that he wore *vestis peregrina* and nobody cared, not even Plautus, or (3) that those who noticed the difference in costume between the two brothers regarded it merely as one of Menaechmus's jokes (see 317-318, 405, 825).

² Merc. 17 is very corrupt; even as emended in the *Triumvirate* edition (= Merc. 4) it is of no use for our purpose. Neither Lindsay's actual text nor his suggested readings show *persona* at all.

disguise.¹ *Larva* does not occur in Terence, according to Westerhov's Index; in Plautus² it seems to be employed only in expressions of contempt and reproach.

Less positive must be the answer to the second question—"Are there any situations in the comedies which indicate that Plautus and Terence intended them to be acted without masks?" Although there are several passages which tempt the reader to answer in the affirmative, the only one which points strongly to such an answer is Phormio 209-212:

AN. Obsecro,
quid si adsimulo, satin est? GE. Garris. AN. Voltum contem-
plamini: em,
satine sic est? GE. Non. AN. Quid si sic? GE. Propemodum.
AN. Quid sic? GE. Sat est.
em istuc serva.

Here the natural inference is that Antipho changed his expression gradually, which he could not have done *personatus*.³ That

¹ Cf. Walde, p. 463: "*Persona*, 'die Rolle, der Charakter einer Person; Larve, Maske des Schauspielers; Person': sowohl gegen die Auffassung als 'die von der Stimme durchschallte Maske' (*per* u. *sonare*; Corssen, Ausspr. I², 482 f., II², 64, 294, wie schon Gellius) als gegen die Annahme von verstümmelter Entlehnung aus Gr. *πρόσωπον* (Keller Volkset, 126) spricht, dass der Ausdruck *persônata* *fábula* älter ist als der Gebrauch der Masken, also nicht von der Bedeutung 'Maske' auszugehen ist. Vielmehr von **persônāre*, -*zônāre*, 'verkleiden' (aus Gr. *ζώνη* u. s. w.; *zônātim* bei Lucil., *sōna*=*ζώνη* bei Plaut., *sōnārius* bei Nov.): *persônāti* 'verkleidete Leute', *persônāta fábula* 'Schauspiel in Verkleidung', daraus rückgebildet *persōna* 'Verkleidung' (Stowasser Wiener Stud. XII, 156). Nicht überzeugend Wiedemann BB. XXVIII, 18, Wz.* *perk-* 'umschliessen', s. *compesco*".

² It is found in Am. 777, Aul. 642, Cap. 598, Cas. 592, Merc. 981, 983: *larvatus* occurs in Men. 890 and M. G. 217 (Triumv. Edit.).

³ C. A. Boettiger (Opuscula [1837], pp. 231 sqq.) seems to have believed that Antipho may have worn a mask which allowed a slight motion of lips and jaws, by which motion he could have effected a sufficient change of expression. No later writer on the subject appears to have found such a supposition probable. I know of only one passage in an ancient author which might possibly lend color to Boettiger's theory: that is in the Onomasticon of Pollux (IV. 133) and is a description of a tragic mask: 'Ο δὲ λευκὸς ἀνὴρ, πᾶς μὲν ἐστὶ πολὺς, βόστρυχοι δὲ περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν. καὶ τὸ γένειον πεπηγὸς, καὶ προσπετῆς ὀφρὺς καὶ παράλευκον τὸ χρῶμα, ὃ δὲ ὄγκος, βραχύς. To infer from this that the chin of a mask was sometimes movable seems to me *exceedingly* questionable. On the contrary, there are evidences that the expression could not generally be changed in this way, for sometimes the two sides of a mask were made with different expressions, one side to be turned to the audience at one time, the

vultus was used by Terence of the face and not merely of the head or in the sense of 'bearing', 'mien', Hoffer thinks he has shown by citing other cases of the word in the comedies of Terence. The instances adduced are And. 119, 839, 857; Haut. 887; Ph. 890; Hec. 369; but in five of these passages (And. 119, 839, 857; Haut. 887; Hec. 369) the word is used of persons not present on the stage, while the sixth (Ph. 890) does not fully justify Hoffer's confidence in its testimony.¹ In Plautus especially there are numerous references to weeping, growing pale, etc., but they seem no more significant than similar cases in the modern theater—indeed, perhaps less significant, for in later times, at least, the Roman theater was vastly larger than ours.

The presence of masks in the illustrated MSS. of Terence is no argument for the early use of *personae* on the Roman stage, especially since more recent investigations tend to indicate a much later date for the archetype of those MSS. than Leo asserted for them a quarter of a century ago.² Moreover, every new examination of the recent photographic reproductions of the miniatures is yielding an increasing body of evidence for the unreliability of the pictures in matters of detail. In connection

other at another time. In Quintilian II. 3. 74, after a reference to tragic masks, we find the following words: In comoediis vero praeter aliam observationem, qua servi, lenones, parasiti, rustici, milites, meretriculae, ancillae, senes austeri ac mites, iuvenes severi ac luxuriosi, matronae, puellae inter se discernuntur, pater ille, cuius praecipuae partes sunt, quia interim concitatus, interim lenis est, altero erecto altero composito est supercilio; *atque id ostendere maxime latus actoribus moris est, quod cum iis, quas agunt, partibus congruat.*

¹ The most striking case which I recall from Plautus of change in facial expression is in the mad scene of the *Menaechmi* (828-875). Here a large part of the expression is in the eyes of *Menaechmus II* (it was to the effect on ocular expression, be it remembered, that Cicero represented the *senes* as especially objecting in connection with the use of masks: *De Orat.* III. 59. 221). A similar description of madness occurs in *Captivi* 594 ff. Of both these passages it may be said that the points noted are part of the standing diagnosis of *insania* among the Greeks and the Romans . . . At first sight a change of expression from grave to gay seems to be implied in *Ter. Eun.* 304, but the editors generally take *alacris* as = *commotus*.

² Whereas Leo (*Rh. Mus.* 38 [1883], 341 ff.) placed the archetype of C, P, F, and O between about 39 B. C. and 79 A. D., Bethe (*Terenti Codex Ambrosianus* H 75 inf. phototypice editus, 1903, Praef. 51-64) thinks it could not have been earlier than the second century A. D., while Dr. Otto Engelhardt (*Die Illustrationen der Terenzhandschriften*, Jena, 1903, pp. 83-92) would make the date as late as the end of the fifth, or the beginning of the sixth, century A. D.

with masks even more than in the case of stage costume,¹ for example, is their testimony disappointing. In Pollux, *Onomasticon* IV. 143-154, we have a list of forty-four masks used in the New Comedy and numerous other types not described by Pollux are said to be extant in various collections of antiquities. Of course we cannot be sure that the latter types were used on the stage; neither can we be positive that Pollux's account of scenic matters can be applied to the Roman stage in an early period. Still, we have a right to expect some variety and individuality in the masks of the Terentian miniatures, if they really represent those used in stage-productions of the plays. As a matter of fact, in all reliable reproductions of the miniatures at hand there are only two broad classes of masks to be distinguished; the grotesque, big-mouthed type, found on slaves, old men, parasites and comic characters generally, and the naturally formed type, generally found on women and young men.² Of the best illustrated MSS., C and F are very consistent in observing this differentiation, P sometimes uses the large-mouthed mask for women, O always assigns it to old men and slaves and generally to all other characters, the exceptions in the last case being entirely irregular and inconsistent.³ The use of the beard is quite as variable; it almost never accompanies the naturally formed mask, but its use with the grotesque mask varies: in O almost all the men's masks are bearded, in F the beard is seldom used, in C and P the practice wavers, even varying from scene to scene for a given character. It is no less difficult to generalize as to the modes of hair-dressing in the miniatures. In the *Aedicularae* the masks are, of course, larger and more carefully drawn than in the miniatures, but, again, their testimony is vitiated by its incompleteness and even more by its inconsistency: e. g., the number of masks for a given play sometimes differs in the different MSS.,⁴ or, when the names of the characters are

¹ Cf. *Costume in Roman Comedy* (see above, p. 58, n. 1), pp. 13-16.

² This subject is presented at greater length by Dr. Engelhardt (l. c., pp. 40-47).

³ Sometimes O shows a young man or a woman in a large-mouthed mask and, in the next scene, in a naturally formed mask.

⁴ Before the *Adelphoe* F shows 8 masks (without *aedicular*), C 13 masks (8 with large mouths, 5 with mouths naturally formed). Not only are these inconsistent with each other but with the play itself, in which there are 7 characters that might be expected to wear the grotesque mask and 7 women and

assigned to the various masks of an *aedicula*, the assignments are not always correctly made.¹

We may summarize briefly, then, as follows:

(1) There are several Roman traditions pointing to the introduction of masks between the time of Terence and that of Cicero; on the other hand, there are no ancient traditions for the use of masks from the beginning of Roman Comedy, nor do the extant comedies themselves demand masked players.

(2) The exact date of the innovation cannot be given, though the *terminus post quem non* is 91 B. C. (the date of the dialogue in the *De Oratore*) and the *terminus ante quem non* should, if the commonly accepted views of Dziatzko (see pp. 61-2) are granted, be reduced to the first year of the floruit of Minucius Prothymus. In view of the large range of time within which the absence of positive evidence prevents us from defining that floruit with any certainty, we can only conjecture with Ribbeck that Minucius Prothymus and Roscius were contemporaries or with van Wageningen that Minucius Prothymus was the Greek who introduced the unpopular innovation, the final establishment of which, in the minds of all Romans, was really due to the younger actor, the Roman Roscius. In either case we are bound to take into account the undoubted influence of the Greek stage in the years following the momentous conquests of 146 and 130 B. C. That the date was probably later than 130² is a natural inference from *De Oratore* 3. 59. 221 (see above, p. 59).

young men . . . Before the *Hecyra* F. shows no masks, C 11 (6 of old men, 5 of women and young men); but the *Hecyra* has 6 women and young men and only 2 old men and 2 *servi* . . . Before the *Phormio* C and P show 13 masks in three rows, F 8 masks (without *aedicula*) in two rows: in C and P there are 6 grotesque masks and 7 naturally formed, but the play requires 9 of the former and 4 of the latter (even if Hegio and Crito are to be regarded as young men, there is still a discrepancy between the number of masks and the requirements of the play).

¹ For example, in the *Andria* P shows a mask for Glycerium, whose voice is heard only from the background, one for Chrysis, who died before the opening of the play, one for Archylis who very possibly does not appear on the stage at all, no mask for Chremes and a grotesque mask for Pamphilus *Adulescens*.

² Ribbeck (*Röm. Trag.* 661) placed the innovation between the years 114 and 104 B. C. and with these termini Mueller agrees (*Hermann's Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten*, III. 2. 288, n. 1 end): Teuffel-Schwabe I⁵, 25, say about 114 B. C. Their argument seems to be that a generation before 91 B. C.

I have said that this innovation on the Roman stage was probably due to Greek influence. Many writers on the ancient theater state that the object in using masks was to increase the carrying power of the actor's voice. This question has been discussed at length by Otto Dingeldein,¹ who seems to have shown the falsity of such a theory. Nowhere in Greek literature, he says, is such a power assigned to masks, and it certainly could not have belonged to the first masks, which were made of leaves, bark or linen: in Latin literature the false theory is supported by a single passage from a good period, Gellius 5. 7: *Lepide mi hercules et scite Gavius Bassus in libris quos de origine vocabulorum composuit, unde appellata 'persona' sit, interpretatur: a personando enim id vocabulum factum esse coniectat. Nam caput, inquit, et os coperimento personae tectum undique unaque tantum vocis emittendae via pervium, quoniam non vaga neque diffusa est, [set] in unum tantummodo exitum collectam coactamque vocem ciet, magis claros canorosque sonitus facit. Quoniam igitur indumentum illud oris clarescere et resonare vocem facit, ob eam causam 'persona' dicta est, o littera propter vocabuli formam productiore.* On the other hand the famous Diomedes passage, going back to Varro, says nothing about the strengthening of the voice but implies that Roscius's squint was responsible for his use of masks.² The traditional view of the origin and continuance of the practice among the Greeks³ is clearly put by

(i. e. 124 B. C.) the *senes* of Crassus's day saw actors playing without masks, but that masks came in shortly after that time, probably within the next ten years. Schanz (Röm. Lit., Müller's Hdb. VIII. I. 1³, 197) says "Im Jahre 91 war sie bereits vor nicht gar langer Zeit eingeführt worden". However, since Crassus may be interpreted as implying that he and his contemporaries, unlike the *senes*, had never been accustomed to seeing actors performing *regularly* unmasked (*Scaenica Romana*, 37), those authorities seem more reasonable who put the innovation back a considerable number of years before 91 B. C.

¹ In a paper entitled *Haben die Theatermasken der Alten die Stimme verstärkt?*, *Berliner Studien für Class. Philol. u. Archaeologie*, 11, pp. 1-46.

² Cf., however, Dr. Basore's estimate of this view, *A. J. P.* XXIX 225.

³ The uniform use of masks on the Greek stage has until very recently been accepted without question. Even in the last edition of Haigh's *Attic Theatre* (Pickard-Cambridge, 1907, p. 262) no doubt is expressed as to the old tradition. However, scholars are beginning to feel that the evidence for their use in the classical period is not altogether conclusive. See F. L. Hutson's review of Hense's *Die Modificirung der Maske in der griechischen Tragödie*

Dr. Albert Mueller in the following words: "Zum dramatischen Costüm gehörte auch die Maske. Dieselbe stammte von der an den dionysischen Festen, aus welchen das Drama entstanden ist, üblichen Farbung und Vermummung des Gesichtes, da es nun natürlich war dass die Person, welche den Gott darstellte, das eigene Gesicht unkenntlich zu machen suchte. Auch später scheinen bei festlichen Gelegenheiten manche Priester die Maske ihrer Gottheit getragen zu haben. . . . Getragen von religiöser Scheu, hielt sich der Gebrauch der Masken bis in die späteste Zeit,¹ und man übersah das in der Maske liegende Unnatürliche um so eher, als die Schauspieler einerseits bei den mehr typischen als individuellen Gestalten der Tragödie im Stande waren, das ganze Stück hindurch eine Grundstimmung festzuhalten, anderseits unter der Maske sich leichter den oft allen Anstand überschreitenden Scherzen der Komödie hinzugeben vermochten".¹

CATHARINE SAUNDERS.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

(Class. Philol. 3. 458-459) and A. W. Verrall's review of Kelley Rees's *The Rule of the Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama* (Class. Rev. 23. 191 ff.).

¹ Mueller, l. c., pp. 270-272.

IV.—κ AND π FORMS IN THE EARLY IONIC POETS.

The pronominal stem πo- (πη-) frequently appears as κo- in the MSS of the early Ionic poets (e. g., *δοκίην* Archil. 70¹); in most of the prose writings there is a preponderating majority of κ forms, while Homer and the inscriptions of the Ionic cities and their colonies (always including the Islands) present nothing but πo and πη.

SUGGESTED EXPLANATIONS.

Various attempts have been made to account for the origin of these mysterious forms in κ; but no thoroughly satisfactory explanation has yet been offered.

RIDGEWAY. Professor Ridgeway (*Early Age of Greece I*) holds the κ to be a survival from primitive Greek; "literary Ionic kept the original forms in κ such as *κοῖος, κῶς* = *ποῖος, πῶς*. Now, as the forms with κ are not found on any inscriptions, it is plain that the Ionians had abandoned them before the sixth century B. C. . . . The archaic form always survives in literature when it has ceased to be used vernacularly", p. 676. The use by the Samians of *Κυανόψια* for the *Πυανόψια* festival of Athens and the *Πανόψια* of other Greek states is not a sufficient proof that in Ionic the κ forms represent the speech of the earliest emigrants; the κ of *Κυανόψια* may owe its form to popular etymology or be due to some other purely local reason.

Why, with this single exception, should the alternation of κ and π be confined to one solitary instance, the pronominal stem πo? It is a widespread phenomenon in the other interrelated Indo-Germanic dialects commonly adduced as parallels; cf. Irish *cach*, Welsh *pwŷ* Lat. *quisque*, Oscan *pispis*: Ir. *cethir*, W. *pedwar*, Lat. *quattuor*, Osc. *petora*: Ir. *coic*, W. *pump*, Lat. *quinque*, Umbrian *puntes* ('pentads'): and even in loan-words Ir. *casc*, W. *pasg* (*Pascha*, Easter). No theory can be regarded as fully adequate unless it accounts for the restricted use of κ and π in the dialects of Greece.

Prof. Ridgeway dismisses the question of the absence of κ forms from Homer as one "which those who allege an Ionic origin for

the poems or parts of the poems will have to answer". For "if the poems were composed on the mainland of Greece in either Thessaly or Argolis under the domination of the labializing Achaeans, then the non-appearance of the κ forms is explained on the same principle as that by which we have already explained the appearance of *πέτταρες*, *πίσυρες* and *ἵππος*. . . . The argument from the κ forms only holds good against Ionia, and not against the Aeolid, as the possible place of origin for the Homeric poems", p. 677.

But the difficulty by no means disappears; even if it is admitted that the π forms originated in the European home of the epic, how comes it that the Homeric poems offer no single instance of the Ionic κ, while other Ionisms, e. g., η for ā, are ubiquitous? Is it at all likely that amid so many innovating tendencies a rigid archaism should have prevailed in the case of forms so easily admitting of change as *ὁπότε* and *πῶς*?

The three examples quoted by Ridgeway afford no parallel; *πέτταρες* is not found in Homer; *πίσυρες* could not, for metrical reasons, be changed to *τέσσαρες*; and *ἵππος*, not *ἱκκος* with its un-Ionic κκ is the form always used even by those representatives of pure Ionic who write *ὁκότε* and *κῶς*.

MÖLLER. Some (e. g. Möller) maintain that Ind.-Germ. κ^v lost its labialization (v) in the enclitic forms of these words and became κ, that is, when the following vowel did not bear the accent; resulting in a double series *κως*, *κον*, *ὄκως*, *ὄκου*, *πῶς*, *ποῦ*, *κτλ.*; the distinction was subsequently lost owing to the workings of analogy; the κ forms invaded the territory of the π forms, and *vice versa*.

BRUGMANN. Brugmann (Griech. Gr¹, p. 33) suggested that in Greek Ind.-Germ. κ^vā- became κᾱ; accordingly there once existed side by side pronouns and adjectives in πo- masc. (from κ^vo-) and κα- fem. (from κ^va-), with adverbs κᾱ κᾱ. Then followed a levelling process which varied in different dialects; in Ionic the π forms were all expelled in favour of κ; in the other dialects the masc. π drove out the fem. κ, except in *καί* which retained its original κ; cf. Lith. *kai*, Old Bulg. *ce*. There are two serious objections to this solution:

(1) There is not sufficient evidence for the existence of κ forms in the other dialects. Brugmann's single parallel rests upon the very dubious derivation of *καί* from an Ind.-Germ. labialized root. Two solitary instances of κ for π in Lesbian, *ὄκαι* (if the reading be correct) and *ὄκοσσον* (Cyme), instead of the usual *ὄππα ὄππως κτλ.*

may indeed indicate that the area invaded by κ forms embraced the Aeolians as well as their Ionian neighbours; dialectic innovations often extend into two districts of entirely different linguistic origin, e. g., psilosis, which affected Lesbos as well as Asiatic Ionia.

(2) If the change from κ^va to κa occurred in primitive Greek, how is it that there is not a single κ form in the earliest Ionic (and Aeolic) that has come down to us, while in a later period of the dialect (Callinus, etc.) they appear in comparatively numerous quantities? There is no evidence that the fem. κa - was ever more frequent than its own creation the masc. κo -; curiously enough the only representatives of the former in early Ionic poetry have both π , viz. $\pi\eta$ Archil. 60, $\delta\pi\eta$ Sim. Am. 1².

In addition to the above theory that had been propounded in the first edition Brugmann offers another explanation in Gr. Gr.². Ionic, he maintains, may once have possessed a form $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma = \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, in Thessalian $\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. Under the influence of this word πo - became $\kappa\acute{o}$ -; afterwards $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ became $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ and $\kappa\acute{o}$ - κo -, for which latter change he compares $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\kappa\kappa\omicron\nu$ for $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu$ (cf. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\kappa\acute{\upsilon}$ -s) and $\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ (cf. $\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\upsilon}$ -s). We see the process reversed in Cyprian $\delta\pi\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma = \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\varsigma$ where π is due to the influence of πo - [cf. $\delta\pi\iota$ 'auf welche Weise', zum pronom. Stamm $q\acute{u}i$, $\tau\iota$ -s Thumb, Gr. Dial. 1909].

This theory is hardly convincing, as it postulates the influence of a form which cannot be proved to have existed. In his third edition Brugmann rejects his previous hypotheses in favour of Solmsen's view that the κ forms started from combinations like $\omicron\kappa\omega\varsigma \omicron\kappa\iota\varsigma$; (cf. $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\iota\varsigma$ for $\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\iota\varsigma$), the original labial being lost owing to the presence of υ as in $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, $\beta\omicron\nu\kappa\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ($\alpha\iota\pi\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$). This explanation which has been adopted by Hirt, Buck (Gr. Dial. 1910), and many other scholars, is certainly the best that has yet been offered, and would at least account for the co-existence of π and κ forms in early Ionic.

EVIDENCE: GRAMMARIANS; INSCRIPTIONS; MS TRADITION.

GRAMMARIANS. There is frequent mention of this Ionic peculiarity (κ for π) in the writings of the ancient grammarians; it is, for instance, included among the five special characteristics of Ionic in the *Περὶ Ἰάδου* commonly attributed to Johannes Grammaticus (sixth century A. D.), a work itself derived from Alexandrian sources.

INSCRIPTIONS. The evidence of inscriptions, in spite of its limited range, is, on the whole, clear and unmistakable. The following is a complete list of all Ionic inscriptions bearing upon the question. The references are to Collitz and Bechtel's collection, *Gr. Dial. Inschr.*

IONIC OF ASIA.

δοῖον Iasus (a colony of Miletus) 5517, not long after 450 B. C.; ὅπου Halicarnassus 5727, early fourth century B. C.; ὁπόσσοι Teos, 5633, 370–50 B. C. according to Wackernagel, early Hellenistic according to Judeich; πον Zeleia (a colony of Miletus) 5532, soon after the battle at the Granicus 334 B. C. The following are of no value, as the inscriptions in which they occur exhibit numerous marks of Attic influence: πον Teos 5634; ὅπως (twice) Samos 5698.

IONIC OF THE ISLANDS.

δόραι, ὁπότεροι Eretria 5307, between 410 and 390 B. C.; ὅπου Ceos 5398, late fifth century; ποτε (? in an elegiac couplet?) Amorgos 5353, in the archaic Ionic alphabet; ὅπου, ὅπως Thasos 5483, early fourth century B. C.; πον Amphipolis (i. e. Chalcis) 5282, 357 B. C.

Π AND K FORMS IN THE TEXT OF POETS, THEMSELVES NATIVES OF IONIA (INCLUDING THE ISLANDS), WHO WROTE IN THE IONIC DIALECT BEFORE 500 B. C.

MS TRADITION. Callinus of Ephesus: κότ' 1¹; κως 1¹²; κότε 2²; ὁππότε (an Aeolism) 1⁸. All MSS except B read ποτ' 1⁸, but τέρ' is certainly the correct reading. Metres, elegiac.

Archilochus of Paros and Thasos: πω 25² (iamb.); πῆ 60 (tetr.); ὁκοίην 70², ὁκοίσις 70³ (tetr.); πον 73 (tetr.); ποῖον 94¹ (epode); πῶς 122 (εἶδος ἀδελφον); κω or κως in a recently discovered fragment of an epode, Strassburg Papyrus (second century A. D.) edited by Diehl Supplem. Lyricum, Archil. 3⁶. Thumb, *Gr. Dial.*, p. 352, quotes κω or κως from "the Parian fragment of Archilochus"; there is some mistake about this, as no such instance occurs in the published texts of the Parian inscription (no. 4 in Diehl); Thumb was probably thinking of the Strassburg papyrus.

Simonides of Amorgos: ὅπη 1²; ὅπως 1⁵ (iamb.); ὅκως 7²², ὅκου 7⁹¹, κοτ' 7⁹⁹, ὅκου 7¹⁰⁶ (iamb.).

Mimnermus of Colophon: *κοτ'* 11¹; *ποτ'* 12²; *οὔποτε* 14⁵.
Metres, elegiac.

Xenophanes of Colophon: *οὔποτε* 1⁵; *όπόσον* 1¹⁷; *ποτε* 6².
Metres, elegiac.

Hipponax of Ephesus: in 19¹ most editors read *κω χλαῖναν* for the MS *χωλεύαν, χλαῖναν, τήν χλαῖναν; χώλαιναν* old editions. Some (e. g. Brink, Bergk) read *κοτ' ἐγγύς* 42²; MSS *κατ' ἐγγύς*, and *κάτεγγυς* which Hoffmann accepts, quoting a note by Meineke "*κάτεγγυς* dictum ut *κατιθύς, κατευθύ* κτλ."; this is adopted by the revisers of Bergk's text who reject his reading *κοτ' ἐγγύς*. The above instances of *κ* forms have therefore no MS authority. *δκου* 51² (chol.) also quoted as *δπου* in schol. Lycophr. 579; *δπως* 85³ (hexam.); *πῶς* 87 (hexam.).

Ananius, a contemporary and perhaps fellow-citizen of Hipponax: *που* 1¹ (chol.) in a quotation made by Aristophanes (Frogs 659); an Attic comedy cannot be regarded as a trustworthy witness for *π* in an Ionic poet; cf. Renner (in Curtius: Studien I, p. 156), "cum Ar. tres illos versus Dionysum dicentem faciat, non mirum videtur in Atticam dialectum abiisse".

Anacreon of Teos: in 1⁴ some read *ῆ κου* on (for our present purpose) insufficient MS evidence; others (e. g., Bergk, Farnell) *ἱκου* or *ἱκευ*. Some form with *κ* (*κῶκοτ'*, or *κω τότ'*) is certain in 33; *δκως* 63² according to Athenaeus 427 A, who quotes the same fragment with *δπως* 475 C (inferior MSS *δκως*); for *ποτ'* 85 we have no real authority, as it occurs in a much-quoted proverb (Ar. Plutus 1002) attributed to Anacreon; but *ποτ'* is always the form given in all our sources, e. g., Zenobius V 80. Metres, Anacreontic except 85 (iamb.).

There are two *π* forms in elegies, probably spurious, assigned to Aesop of Samos and Demodocus of Leros: *πῶς* Aes. 1¹; *ποτ'* Dem. 4¹.

RESULTS: allowing the *κ* forms the benefit of the doubt in Hipp. 51² and excluding *όπότε* Callin. 1⁸, as an Aeolism, we get from the MS tradition of the early Ionic poets 13 well-attested forms with *κ*, 15 well-attested forms with *π*.

There is not a single instance of *κ* for *π* in the works of the early poets who wrote in the Ionic dialect, but were not themselves natives of Ionia; the *π* forms are numerous, e. g., *οὔπω* Tyrt. 11², *πω* Theogn. 43, *μήποτε* Theogn. 69. In spite of this fact, Hartung (Gr. Elegiker, Vol. I) has printed Callinus 1 among the elegies of Tyrtæus without even troubling to change

the κ forms in I¹, I¹² (κός', κως). The absence of κ forms affords an argument (if indeed argument were needed) against those who would assign Theognis 1231-1389 to Mimnermus or some other Asiatic poet.

IONIC PROSE.

PROSE. The practice of the early prose-writers in Ionia seems to have varied according to individual preferences. Instances of π are extremely rare in the MSS of Herodotus; but it is doubtful whether they should be expelled in favour of the very common κ in cases where the evidence is unusually strong, as in I 188, where all MSS read δποι or δπη. Hippocrates appears to have preferred π except perhaps in the combination δκ-; but even the ancients were not agreed as to his choice in this respect; as Gomperz has pointed out, the inferior MSS of Hipp. offer a far greater number of κ forms and suggest a desire on the part of the copyists to impart a stronger 'Ionic' colouring to the text. It should be remembered that Hdt. always wrote ὀποδαπός; cf. Xenophanes πηλίκος.

LATER POETRY.

We also meet κ forms in the later poets; Phoenix of Colophon (date unknown) has δκου Athen. 360 A; δκόσον ib. 530 E; χῶκόσ' (twice) 530 E (all chol.); μήποτε occurs in an elegy attributed to Scythinus of Teos (perhaps a contemporary of Plato) rejected as spurious by Bergk, Poet. Lyr. Graec.⁴, p. 508.

In Herodas "the forms in κο- are considerably more frequent than those in πο-". Nairn, Introd., p. lxiv. With regard to the latter he rightly remarks, "it is not certain that these forms with π- for κ- are really Attic. They may be old Ionic", p. lx. Crusius also retains both forms in his text of Herodas, e. g., ποτ' 6²⁷, κοῖος 6⁴⁸.

THE NEW CALLIMACHUS. The same variety is presented by Callimachus. The new fragments of the Aetia (eleg.) and Iambi published and edited by Dr. A. S. Hunt in Oxyrh. Pap. VII, no. 1011 (late fourth century A. D.), have added very considerably to the previously available materials (viz. two instances of κ fr. 85, 93). In the Index to these poems we find 11 κ and 2 π forms, with another example of κ suggested as an alternative conjecture in the notes; for the purpose of our present inquiry these figures require a certain amount of modification. There can, however, be no doubt of the following: κοτε 4, 211 (not in the

pap., but supplied from fr. 93); *ποτε* 54; *ὁπότε* 26; *χάπῳταν* 236; *που* 112; *ἔκου* 93 as proved by fr. 85, pap. *οἴκου* (sic); *κῶς* 161; *κῶς* 278, 403; lines 1-89 come from the Aetia, the rest from the Iambi.

The other forms in the editor's text must be set aside as uncertain for the following reasons:

L. 18. "Wilamowitz objects to *κοτε* as inconsistent with the context . . . and would therefore substitute *καί* . . . In the papyrus *κοτ* or *κατ* is fairly plain". A. S. H.

L. 54. "*Κοτε* is substituted for *ποτε* in this verse on the analogy of ll. 4 and 18. In the Hymns the forms in π are preferred, but the Ionic spelling occurs in some of the Epigrams". A. S. H.

But the evidence for *κοτε* in 18 is very doubtful, and in 236 (Iambi) Dr. Hunt himself accepts the π of the papyrus. L. 112, *που* pap., *κου* text; no reason given. L. 234, ρ . [...] ν pap., text *ὁκ[οίη]* ν . L. 254, *καίγ[.]ρ* pap., *κοῦ γάρ* (text) is a conjecture made by Wilamowitz "which distinctly improves it unless, as Murray suggests, we read in 254 *ἦν*". A. S. H. L. 291, *εικο*. pap., "perhaps *εἰ κοτ'*, possibly *εἰχον*". A. S. H.

RESULTS FOR CALLIMACHUS. Our revised list gives us 6 κ and 4 π forms against the editor's 12 κ and 2 π .

In the Persians of Timotheus we find *ποτ'* 118; and *κῶς* 162, used by a foreigner *Ἰάονα γλώσσαν ἐξιχνεύων*.

LATER PROSE.

Of the later prose-writers and Ionic "revivalists" Lucian preferred κ ; "his only exception seems to be *ποτέ* Dea Syr. 29", according to Professor Weir Smyth who elsewhere in the same book gives Lucian *πῶς* V. A. 4 (Ionic Dialect, p. 291). There is an overwhelming majority of π forms in the Ionic of Arrian; both κ and π occur indiscriminately in the MSS of the other late Ionic writers.

THE BEARING OF THE EVIDENCE ON THE PRACTICE OF MODERN EDITORS.

There is nothing in the above evidence to justify the practical unanimity with which modern editors and grammarians have expelled the π forms from the early elegiac and iambic poets of Ionia; the list includes Fick, Crusius, Biese, Buchholz, Peppmüller, Renner, Hoffmann, and others, but not Bergk, the π

forms of whose *Anthologia Lyrica* have been changed to κ by the editors who revised the text after his death. A typical instance is afforded by the *Gr. Dial.*, Vol. III (Ionic) of Hoffmann, who has added to his chapters on grammar a revised text of Archilochus and other early poets.

HOFFMANN. For his treatment of Callinus see *infra*, p. 83. In *Mimn.* and *Sim. Am.* he has changed every case of π into κ without giving any reason for the correction. In *Hipponax* π is twice changed to κ, in fr. 87 because "the text is corrupt" (*mangelhaft überliefert*), the meaning of which statement we can see on turning to his critical note, "πῶς überliefert: der Dialekt fordert κῶς". On p. 596, he defends ὀπῶς 85³ because it occurs in a "Spottgedicht in Hexametern und im pathetisch-epischen Stile"; but in his text he prints it with κ, although he expresses some hesitation in a critical note. Xenophanes, as "a later elegist" is allowed to retain the traditional forms in π. Why? He was still far too early to be affected by Attic influence.

Except where Archilochus is concerned, Hoffmann apparently regards the tradition of a single κ form in the works of an early Ionic poet as a sufficient reason for the rejection of all the π forms in his writings. Hoffmann has certainly not effected this change on statistical grounds, making the minority conform with the majority; for, of the three examples in *Mimn.*, two have been emended to bring them into line with the single form in κ; and, again, in the case of *Hipponax* considerable emendation is required to make the κ forms balance those in π. It is hard to see why an exception should be made of Archilochus whose κ forms are rejected by H. as hyper-Ionisms; this rejection cannot be due to the insular origin of the poet, as H. more than once tells us that in this respect no distinction can be drawn between the Ionic of Asia and that of the Islands, and indeed he regards -πo- as the only genuine form in the text of Hippocrates and elsewhere (p. 595) tells us that we do not know which Ionic cities use κo for πo. Nor can he have been led to this choice by the occurrence of π forms alone in the inscriptions of Thasos, where Archilochus spent a considerable part of his life; for he definitely reckons him as a poet of Paros, while he twice expresses a doubt whether Simonides wrote in the dialect of Samos or in that of Amorgos; besides, had he wished to conform with inscriptional evidence, he should

have also 'restored' π to Anacreon of Teos, as the inscriptions of that town present nothing but π forms.

ASIATIC AND ISLAND IONIC. It has been suggested by Wilamowitz (Hom. Untersuch.) that the forms in κ were peculiar to Eastern Ionic, while the π forms were alone in use among the inhabitants of the Islands. The scanty materials at our disposal do not warrant this conclusion. There is, as we have seen, no instance of κ in the inscriptions of Asia or the Islands; our MS evidence does not discriminate between the two districts (Asiatic poets 6 κ , 7 π ; Island poets 7 κ , 7 π). Even if we reject Sim. Am. (as a possible writer of Eastern Ionic) the proportion of π forms (5 π , 3 κ) in the writings of Archilochus is not enough to bear the weight of Wilamowitz's theory. We have still left three κ forms in Archil.; Hauvette (Archiloque) regards the passage in which Arch. 70³ is quoted ('Plato' Eryxias) as a genuine fragment of Prodicus, who got the quotation from Heraclitus; the latter philosopher had changed the π of Archil. to conform with the κ of his own native dialect; but, as Hauvette himself allows, we still have $\delta\kappa\omicron\iota\eta\nu$ in the same passage as given by another source (Stobaeus).

WEIR SMYTH. Professor Weir Smyth believes that "the Ionic dialect possesses both π and κ as in $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\kappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$, $\kappa\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$, and in all connected forms" (Ion. Dial., § 341); but he will not admit that the same poet could use both: "though it cannot be gainsaid that no poet of Ionic birth could use either κ or π in the same word, we are unable to demonstrate in all cases which was the chosen form. In any event I regard it as problematic whether any of the instances of the π forms in the MSS of the iambographs and Ionic elegists (though here the evidence is less certain) are retentions of the original" (ib.). Seeing that "the Ionic dialect possesses both π and κ ", and that early Ionic poetry is full of epic reminiscences, we should naturally expect to find a poet using forms in π , even though his own city-dialect preferred κ . If he was at liberty to introduce a genitive singular in $-\omicron\iota\omicron$ as well as in $-\omicron\nu$, why could he not adopt a similar variety in the form of a pronominal stem? Sophocles in his lyrics could write $\mu\eta\chi\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ (Antig. 349) and $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ (Ajax 181), if, with Jebb and other editors, we accept the best MS tradition. If an Athenian could write $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$, $\eta\eta\nu$, and $\acute{\alpha}\nu$, why could not an Ionian write $\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$ and $\kappa\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$, just as an English poet will use *hath* and *has*?

THE EPIC AND EARLY IONIC POETRY. The influence of epic diction is itself a sufficient warrant for the retention of well-attested π forms in Ionic poetry. It is, of course, well-known that later scribes smuggled Attic forms into the MSS of non-Attic writers; it is equally true that the texts of Ionic literature have been inundated with a mass of hyper-Ionisms (e. g. *μηδεμίην* Theogn. (A.) 152, *αὔτέων* masc. in Hdt.), falsely deduced from the salient features of the Ionic dialect, of which the most obvious are undoubtedly the use of η for Attic α after ε, ι, ρ, and the substitution of κ for π in pronominal stems. It is not unlikely then that π was sometimes changed to κ in the MSS of Ionic authors. It is worth nothing that we rarely have κ and π in the same fragment of an early poet, e. g., π twice in Sim. Am. 1, κ four times in Sim. Am. 7, though we owe both poems to the same anthology (Stobaeus). This indicates that the text of the poets may have been tampered with by early scribes for the sake of securing uniformity.

Subdialectal differences may indeed have existed in the various Ionic cities, and the κ (or π) forms may have been confined to the speech of certain localities; but, as far as we can judge, the early poets wrote in an Ionic *κοινή* tinged (in the case of the elegists at any rate) with a strong admixture of epic words and forms.

HOFFMANN. Hoffmann, Fick, and others, it is true, deny the influence of Homer on the phonetics and morphology of Archilochus and Callinus. But forms like *Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνακτος* (with the un-Ionic digamma) or, if we accept the variant preferred by H., *Ἐν. θεοῖο* (Arch. 1¹), and *ὁππότε κεν δῆ* (Callin. 1⁸) are a sufficient proof that the writers did not confine themselves to pure Ionic. It is, to put it mildly, sheer begging of the question to regard *ἔσσεται, πελάγεσσι, τόσσον* and the like as "genuine Ionic forms no longer spoken in the language of daily life" (Hoffmann). We have no evidence that they ever existed in uncontaminated literary Ionic, nor can we explain away *ὁππότε κεν δῆ* by calling it "a quotation from Homer" (Hoffmann); we could with equal justice extend the name to other π forms in early Ionic poetry; cf. *οὐ ποτε πάμπαν*, Od. 4, 693; 11, 528, which recurs in the same metrical position in Mimn. 14⁵, where H. has altered *ποτε* to *κοτε*. In this particular case (Callin. 1⁸) the metre did not allow the correction of *ὁππότε* to *ὀκότε*, and Bach's conjecture *ὀκκότε* is a 'ghost-form', for -κκ- like -ππ- is a combination unknown to

Ionic; *κεν* could have been accounted for as a loan from the vocabulary of Homer, a proceeding admitted by Hoffmann. So he had to content himself with calling the phrase a 'quotation', though he cannot refrain from adding a doubt as to the authenticity of the text. The presumption is that poets who borrow words and phrases from Homer will also borrow forms from the same source. And H. himself (p. 184) asserts that the imitation of the non-Ionic element in Homer begins with so early a writer as Mimnermus. What we deny is not the greater frequency of such forms in later Ionic poetry, but their entire absence, as claimed by Hoffmann, from the works of the oldest Ionian poets.

INSCRIPTIONS. The testimony of the inscriptions is, as we have seen, somewhat meagre, and their dialect is occasionally open to grave suspicion; e. g., *δντας* 5727, *ξένων* 5517, *ἐρίων* 5633, *ταύταις* 5398 betray a tendency to use Attic forms which appears in a colony of Miletus (5517) as early as the fifth century B. C. The cumulative evidence is still quite enough to prove beyond all doubt the existence of *π* forms in Ionic territory (cf. 5307 Eretria, and the early inscription from Amorgos); but the inscriptions are by no means sufficiently numerous or free from the suspicion of Atticism to disprove the presence of an alternative *κ* element in other Ionic localities as well as in the very towns to which we are indebted for the inscriptions themselves.

SUMMARY. To sum up; although our material is limited, general considerations, such as the influence of Homer, and the testimony of Ionic inscriptions, as well as statistics based upon a multifarious MS tradition, all point in the same direction, viz., to the indiscriminate use of *κ* and *π* by the pre-Herodotean poets of Ionia. We cannot draw any distinction in this respect between the Ionic of Asia and that of the Islands; in neither quarter do the inscriptions give a single instance of a *κ* form, and a careful sifting of the literary (i. e. MS) evidence maintains herein a remarkably even balance between the two districts. The editor of these poets must therefore in every case make his choice of *κ* or *π* according to the MS testimony at his disposal.

T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES, BANGOR.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

ARISTOTLE ON THE ART OF POETRY.

A revised text with critical introduction, translation and commentary by INGRAM BYWATER. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1909. 8°. Pp. XLVII+387. \$4.00.

This is the first comprehensive critical edition of the *Poetics* of Aristotle, with translation and commentary, to appear in recent years. We may, therefore, fittingly begin a review of this important work with a brief survey of the history of the *Poetics*.

We know almost nothing of the status of the *Poetics* in the Greek and Alexandrian periods. There are many latent references to the work, however, in the rhetoricians and the Homeric Scholia which indicate that its principles had deeply influenced the literary criticism of the time. Antiquity does not seem to have regarded it as one of the great works of Aristotle. In the eighth century the *Poetics* were translated into Syriac, and in the eleventh from Syriac into Arabic. Upon this Arabic version the commentary of Averrhoes (ob. 1198) was based, which was translated into Hebrew and from Hebrew into Latin in 1515. Apart from the fact that the oldest extant Greek MS (A^c) was written about 1000 A. D., there is but slight indication of interest in the work in the Middle Ages. The *Poetics* were not among the Aristotelian books which found translators in the 13th century.

The modern history of the *Poetics* begins in the second half of the 15th century. The Greek text was a favorite work among the Italian humanists. In 1498, the first Latin translation, that of G. Valla, was given to the world. Strange to say, it was not included in the great Aldine Aristotle of 1495-8.

The *editio princeps* of the Greek text appeared finally in 1508 in Vol. I of the Aldine *Rhetores Graeci*. The editor, Demetriusucas, to the misfortune of sound scholarship, used one of the poorer manuscripts and indulged in frequent emendations on his own account. It is in consequence full of corruptions, but notwithstanding held for centuries its supremacy—as a sort of *textus receptus*. In 1555, Gu. Morel attempted to supersede it by a recension based on Parisinus 2040, a fairly faithful copy of A^c, but without much success; and the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries witnessed many editions and commentaries based chiefly on the Aldine.

Ritter in 1839 was the first to denounce the *editio princeps* as an entirely untrustworthy text. His contention was carried

further by Spengel (1865) and by Vahlen (1867), who upheld the unique authority of the Parisian manuscript 1741, known as A^c, as the one record of the Greek textual tradition and the ultimate source of all our Renaissance texts. Johannes Vahlen must always be regarded as the father of scientific criticism and study of the Poetics. In his *Beiträge zu Aristoteles' Poetik* (1865) and his critical editions of 1867 and 1874, he not only established a satisfactory text but also provided a copious and learned commentary on every important problem needing interpretation, from which all later editors have freely drawn.

The late Professor Butcher, in his essays on the Poetics in the first edition of *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius* and in his *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, which with text, critical notes, translation and a series of essays has passed through three editions, has produced an independent text and made a thorough exposition of Aristotle's theory of poetry and art in the light of the author's general system of philosophy. Because of the fundamental nature of the principles of epos and tragedy presented by Aristotle, the Poetics have been the source of numerous treatises in the past two centuries. Butcher gives 66 titles of editions and translations and other writings relating to the work, and several more have appeared in recent years. The English predecessors of Butcher and Bywater most deserving of mention are Goulston (1696), Twining (1789), and Tyrwhitt (1794).

In this work of Professor Bywater we have the presentation of introduction, text, translation and commentary in one volume of XLVII + 387 pages. As Bywater and Butcher represent entirely different schools of thought both as to text and interpretation, it will be well as we proceed to indicate points of contrast between these two able Aristotelians.

The first section of Bywater's Introduction is a consideration of the form and structure of the existing Poetics. The author begins by pointing out that many of the difficulties of the Poetics are the result of preconceived notions in regard to the general character of the Aristotelian writings, namely, that all of them must conform to rigid standards of logic and be perfect in matters of form. The Poetics, on the contrary, judged by our modern standards of literary correctness, are marked by great inequalities and are frequently open to criticism. Among anomalies of language or thought, Bywater notes instances of (1) anticipatory use of technical terms, (2) variations of terminology, (3) inconsistency in the use of terms, (4) inconsistency of thought and (5) lapse of memory. There are also difficulties in the general plan and structure. The scheme as a whole is admirably simple and logical, consisting of five parts: (1) a preliminary discourse on tragedy, epos and comedy (cc. 1-5); (2) a definition of tragedy and rules for its construction (cc. 6-22); (3) rules for the construction of an epic poem (cc. 23-24); (4) classification of current

criticisms of an epic or tragedy and of replies to them (c. 25); and (5) a comparison of epic poetry and tragedy, showing the artistic superiority of the latter (c. 26). But great difficulties are met with which call in doubt the genuineness of certain chapters and suggest the rearrangement of certain sections. Transposition, however, only makes matters worse, and the best solution is to conclude that Aristotle, like Homer, sometimes nods and never gave a finished form to the work.

The second section is entitled *The Lost Second Book*, and gives internal and external evidence to show that our treatise is only the surviving portion of a larger work, being Book I of the original treatise. There are indications that Book II must have covered (1) the discussion of Comedy promised in *Poet.* 6. 2 and (2) the Catharsis theory referred to in *Pol.* 8. 7.

The third section treats *The History of the Poetics*, which we have briefly sketched.

The major part of the Introduction, however, is devoted to the existing data for the constitution of the text and the apographa, a technical name for all later MSS, being the fourth and fifth sections respectively. The sources of the textual tradition of the *Poetics* are two, namely, the Parisian MS 1741, known as *A^c* and (2) the traces of another Greek text recoverable from the Arabic version and the surviving fragment of the lost Syriac version. Bywater follows Vahlen in ascribing unique authority to *A^c*—a fine specimen of Byzantine calligraphy of the tenth or eleventh century, which he regards as the archetype of all later MSS—and in questioning the value of the Arabic version. In both these respects his position is diametrically opposed to that of Butcher.

Bywater considers the Arabic version as valuable merely because we are often able to look beyond it so as to recover the readings of a Greek MS at least three centuries anterior to *A^c*. He does not regard the Syriac version as an accurate piece of work and thinks that even if the Greek original (Σ) were before us, its readings would have to be considered one by one on its merits. Butcher, on the contrary, while recognizing the superiority of *A^c* over all other extant MSS, cannot share the confidence with which Vahlen and Bywater speak of it as the sole source from which the rest are derived. He also places a far higher estimate upon the Arabic version, showing how in some 50 instances where the Arabic points to a Greek original diverging from the text of *A^c*, it confirms the readings found in other MSS. He therefore, concludes that the better readings in the 'apographa' confirmed by the Arabic version point to the survival in the 15th century of another textual authority, a now lost Greek MS, independent of *A^c* and free from its errors. Thus Butcher, following chiefly Christ, represents one school of textual critics leaning rather toward the Arabic version, while Bywater, following Vahlen, regards the light from this Oriental quarter

as often a mere *ignis fatuus* and insists upon the absolute supremacy of A^c.

In compliance with the custom of editors of Greek texts of this description, Bywater, like Butcher, faces the text of the Poetics with a translation, or rather a paraphrase, which is a very effective interpretation of the text. As he says in the preface, he has not scrupled to recast many of Aristotle's sentences and to insert here and there words or short clauses in order to make the sense and sequence of ideas clearer. We have in consequence an English version of the Poetics of the best verbal material and texture written in a style so attractive that the reader is often tempted to neglect the Greek and read through at one sitting Bywater's felicitous prose. A good illustration of his method is seen in his rendering of the famous definition of tragedy: "A tragedy, then, is the imitation of an action that is serious, and also, as having magnitude, complete in itself; in language with pleasurable accessories, each kind brought in separately in the parts of the work; in a dramatic, not in a narrative form; with incidents arousing pity and fear, wherewith to accomplish its catharsis of such emotions. Here by 'language with pleasurable accessories' I mean that with rhythm and harmony or song superadded; and by 'the kinds separately' I mean that some portions are worked out with verse only, and others in turn with song."¹

As regards the commentary, Bywater's notes are generally short and to the point. He frequently cites pertinent passages from other works of Aristotle, from Plato and other Greek writers, but seldom refers by name to modern editors. The influence of Vahlen's Beiträge shows itself throughout, but he manifestly has little patience with Butcher's endeavor to expound Aristotle's theory of art.

In fact, in the preface, he states that he has not ventured on a discussion of the problem of Aristotle's general theory of Poetry and Art, as it would require a volume by itself to deal with a matter of such extreme complexity and would lead into regions of thought remote from the avowed subject of the Poetics. He thinks that too much has been read into Aristotle's incidental utterances and that Aristotle would himself be surprised, should he come to life again, to see what theories have been credited to him. He adds that the very idea of a Theory of Art is modern, and there is very little to show that Aristotle had ever thought out his ideas of artistic theory sufficiently to reduce them to system even in his own mind. From his silence, therefore,

¹ ἔστιν οὖν τραγῳδία μίμησις πράξεως σπουδαίας καὶ τελείας μέγεθος ἐχούσης, ἡδυσμένῳ λόγῳ χωρὶς ἐκάστῳ τῶν εἰδῶν ἐν τοῖς μορίοις, δρώντων καὶ οὐ δι' ἀπαγγελίας, δι' ἑλέου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιοῦτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν. λέγου δὲ ἡδυσμένον μὲν λόγον τὸν ἔχοντα ῥυθμὸν καὶ ἁρμονίαν καὶ μέλος, τὸ δὲ χωρὶς τοῖς εἰδεσι τὸ διὰ μέτρων ἑνια μόνον περαίνεσθαι καὶ πάλιν ἕτερα διὰ μέλους.—1449 b 24-31

we may infer that Butcher's elaborate essays found little favor with Bywater.

The only note of sufficient length to approach the essay form is Bywater's discussion of the interpretation of *Kátharsis* in the definition of tragedy, as to whether the term is to be understood as a physiological metaphor, in the sense of 'purging' or 'clearing away', or as a metaphor from the religious rite of lustration in the sense of 'purification'. He concludes that the ancient evidence, in Aristotle and elsewhere, is very strongly in favor of the first interpretation.

This, the pathological interpretation, is generally associated with the names of Weil (1848) and Bernays (1857) though in its essential points it is much older, as seen in Tyrwhitt's (1794) note on the present passage. It signifies that the tragic excitement "serves as a sort of medicine producing a *catharsis* to lighten and relieve the soul (*κουφίζεσθαι*) of the accumulated emotion within it; and as the relief is wanted, there is always a harmless pleasure attending the process of relief". Bywater's admirable treatment of this subject makes us wish he had in like manner expanded his discussion of many disputed problems of the Poetics. Butcher also adopted the pathological theory of Catharsis and contributed to it an artistic element by showing that the function of tragedy is "not merely to provide an outlet for pity and fear, but to provide for them a distinctively aesthetic satisfaction, to purify and clarify them by passing them through the medium of art". This I regard as a much broader and more satisfactory interpretation of *Catharsis*.

To take up some points of detail, I cannot agree with Bywater in his interpretation of certain passages of C. XXV, discussing *προβλήματα* and *λύσεις*, or objections made to poetry and the answers to them. He begins by stating Aristotle's postulates which may supply the defense with arguments to meet the attacks of critics, but when he comes to the general observation at the close of this section beginning, *περὶ δὲ τοῦ καλῶς ἢ μὴ καλῶς ἢ εἴρηται τι καὶ ἢ πέπρακται* (1461 a 4-9) he translates, "As for the question whether something said or done in a poem is *morally* right or not", etc., and in his note to the passage states that "the objection Aristotle is now considering is the moral objection, the criticism that something said or done by a personage in a poem is not *morally* right". This rendering of *καλῶς* is inconsistent with his own translation of *καλῶς* in the opening sentence of the Poetics, *πῶς δὲ συνίστασθαι τοὺς μύθους εἰ μέλλει καλῶς εἶναι ἢ ποιῆσθαι* "of the structure of plot required for a good poem". *καλῶς* is uniformly used in the Poetics to express what is *poetically* right, and we have an aesthetic, not a moral, reference in this passage. Cf. c. VIII, 1451 a 22-24, c. XIII, 1453 a 12, etc., which prove that Aristotle uses *καλῶς* to express the artistic correctness of a poem or any of its special features. Illustrations drawn from the Homeric Scholia demonstrate this interpretation. What Aristotle

here asserts is that speech or action must be interpreted in the light of all the circumstances—the persons, the occasion, the end it is designed to serve; and if from a study of these the speech or action shows itself to be in accordance with necessity or probability, then its artistic excellence—and this is ever supreme with Aristotle—is assured. Butcher's translation in his third edition is more exact. "Again in examining whether what has been said or done by some one is poetically right or not, we must not look merely to the particular act or saying and ask whether it is poetically good or bad", etc.

The determination of the twelve λύσεις or Solutions has long troubled editors (*αἱ δὲ λύσεις ἐκ τῶν ἀριθμῶν σκεπτέαι, εἰσὶν δὲ δώδεκα*, 1461 b 24–25) and Bywater does not seem to have been much influenced by the more recent investigations of this subject. Thus he separates in an arbitrary manner the alternatives under the first postulate that, as the poet is an imitator, the poetic picture may represent either *οἷα ἦν ἢ ἔστιν* or *οἷα φασι καὶ δοκεῖ* or *οἷα εἶναι δεῖ* and gets five different λύσεις namely, (1) *οἷα ἦν*, (2) *οἷα ἔστιν*, (3) *οἷα φασιν (εἶναι)*, (4) *οἷα δοκεῖ (εἶναι)* and (5) *οἷα εἶναι δεῖ*. This analysis is palpably too minute, there being only three λύσεις under this postulate, namely, (I) Poetic Truth (*οἷα εἶναι δεῖ*), (II) Current Legends (*οἷα φασιν καὶ δοκεῖ*) and (III) Custom (*οἷα ἦν ἢ ἔστιν*).

Then under the second postulate that poetic language is not the same as ordinary speech, he finds only six modes of interpretation of the written letter of poetry, namely, (6) γλώττη (7) κατὰ μεταφοράν (8) κατὰ προσωδίαν (9) διαιρέσει (10) ἀμφιβολία and (11) κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς λέξεως, whereas Aristotle distinctly adds and illustrates with an example a seventh λύσις under *ἐκ τῆς λέξεως* in the passage *δεῖ δὲ καὶ ὅταν ὄνομά τι ὑπεναντίωμά τι δοκῇ σημαίνειν, ἐπισκοπεῖν ποσαχῶς ἂν σημαῖνοι τοῦτο ἐν τῷ εἰρημένῳ, οἷον τῷ "τῇ ῥ' ἔσχετο χάλκεον ἔγχος" τὸ ταύτη κωλυθῆναι ποσαχῶς ἐνδέχεται* (1461 a, 31–34). "But whenever also a word seems to imply some contradiction, it is necessary to reflect how many ways there may be of understanding it in the passage in question; e. g., in Homer's *τῇ ῥ' ἔσχετο χάλκεον ἔγχος* one should consider the possible senses of 'was stopped', etc. This corresponds in its sense and application to (X) ὁμωνυμία treated and illustrated in Soph. El. IV 166 a 6 ff. as a λύσις ἐκ τῆς λέξεως, and as it is frequently appealed to in the Homeric Scholia to explain the so-called inconsistencies of Homer, it is surely one of the most important of the λύσεις. It is true that Bywater holds that ἀμφιβολία mentioned above is the same thing as what Aristotle calls elsewhere ὁμωνυμία (see note on 1461 a 25), but at the same time he cites Soph. el. 4, 165 b where ἀμφιβολία is distinguished from ὁμωνυμία. ἀμφιβολία is concerned with the variety of senses in two or more words from their grammatical connection; while ὁμωνυμία or ποσαχῶς ἂν σημάνειε considers which of a variety of the natural senses of a word is the proper one in a disputed passage (cf. M. Carroll, Aristotle's Poetics in

the Light of the Homeric Scholia, pp. 51-55, J. H. U. thesis, Baltimore, 1895).

Finally, under the third postulate that poetry as a distinct art has a correctness of its own, Bywater finds only one λύσις, whereas there are two, illustrated by examples, namely, (XI) the End of Poetry (τὸ τέλος, 1460 b 23), and (XII) the Accidental (πρὸς συμβεβηκός, 1460 b 29-32) in explanation of technical inaccuracies as regards other arts and sciences. Thus the grouping is (3 + 7 + 2), not (5 + 6 + 1) as Bywater puts it.

The volume concludes with an Appendix giving a synopsis of versions and paraphrases of the clause about the *Calharsis*, an Index of Greek Words and an Index to the Commentary.

MITCHELL CARROLL.

TWO STUDIES IN NOUN SUFFIXES.

Greek Diminutives in *-iov*. A Study in Semantics. By WALTER PETERSEN, PH. D., Professor of Greek in Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas. Weimar, 1910.

The Suffixes *-mant* and *-vant* in Sanskrit and Avestan. By HAROLD H. BENDER, PH. D., Instructor in Modern Languages in Princeton University. Johns Hopkins Dissertation: Baltimore, 1910.

Two different points of view in the scholarly investigation of noun suffixes are represented by these works. Dr. Petersen's title plainly states that his primary interest lies in the semantic development of his suffixes, and he has little to say about phonetics. Dr. Bender, on the other hand, devotes only 25 out of the 99 pages of the descriptive part of his text to semantics; the rest deals with the phonetic correlation of his suffixes and their euphonic combination with word bases. This is, however, no reflection on the scholarship of either author; the reason lies rather in the facts of the case. The semantic uses of the suffixes *mant* and *vant* are not particularly varied or interesting, while the phonetic questions connected with them deserve, as Bender shows, very close study. On the other hand, whatever phonetic interest there may be in the Greek *-iov* suffixes is entirely overshadowed by their very complicated and interesting semantics.

Bender's work of 116 large pages is divided into two parts, the larger section dealing with the Sanskrit language, the smaller with the Avestan. He has found 2200 words in Vedic and Classical Sanskrit ending in *mant* and *vant*; of these 1748 have *vant*

and 452 *mant*. The proportion of *mant* to *vant* words is slightly larger in the RV., but from AV. on it is about as in Classical Sanskrit, viz. 1 : 4. The complicated question of the choice between the suffixes, i. e., in what cases *mant* was used and in what cases *vant*, has remained in a state of hopeless confusion, in spite of the efforts of Pāṇini and Benfey to straighten it out. It has remained for Bender successfully to accomplish the task. By a comparison of the state of things in the Avesta, the Veda, and the later Sanskrit he shows that it depends on the vowel of the syllable before the suffix, in the following way :

1) In Indo-Iranian, as in Avestan, *mant* was used after an *u*-vowel, or a consonant immediately preceded by an *u*-vowel; other stems took *vant*.

2) In the early parts of the Veda *vant* is still used after *ā*-stems (or those in which *ā* preceded a final consonant), but other vowels (that is the *i*-vowels and *ṛ*) have begun to go over to *mant*, which predominates with all except *i*. The *u*-vowels still keep to *mant*.

3) In later Sanskrit *mant* has gained the field almost to the exclusion of *vant*, in the case of other vowels than *ā*,—except that, curiously, *i* still continues to take *vant* in a majority of cases. (The total number of cases with *i* is, however, comparatively small.)

The number of exceptions is not inconsiderable, but B. is in general successful in explaining them as due to analogy, to parallel word-forms in different vowels, to word or line cadence or the like.

Chapter II deals with the *saṁdhi* of *mant* and *vant*, a very troublesome subject. Not only are the rules of external (instead of internal) combination used in many cases (p. 43 ff.), but there are also many 'lengthenings' and 'shortenings', and even 'omissions' and 'insertions' of final stem vowels. Personally I should substitute 'appear to be' for 'are' in all these cases, without exception; I confess to more skepsis than the author seems to show. And when it comes to 'dropping' and 'inserting' final *consonants*, this skepsis increases. Surely such cases (they are of course very rare) must be purely analogical, except in so far as the 'dropping' of an *n* is concerned; this is of course, as Bender remarks, really no dropping, but the use of a weaker form of the stem (*aṣma-vant*, cf. *aṣman-vant*). B. indeed also calls attention to considerations of analogy, metrical cadence, etc., as being at least occasionally the cause of such phenomena. Especially interesting is his note that before the fem. form (*vatī*) of the suffix a long vowel is particularly common; he thinks this may be due to metrical cadence. May it not also have something to do with the adjectival and nominal fem. endings *ā* and *ī*?

Chapter III deals with the meanings of the suffixes arranged in order of their frequency of occurrence. A number of examples are given under each head; there would have been some

advantage in giving exhaustive lists here, but it seemed better to the author to give his complete lists in phonetic divisions instead. The simplest and most primitive meaning of the suffixes ('possessing, having') prevails, Bender finds, in 60% of the cases. Next in order of frequency are the words having the force of present participles (7—10%). The arrangement of the groups in descending arithmetical progression necessarily separates related groups; the author however undertakes to supply this deficiency by a section in which he treats briefly of these relationships, with an illustrative diagram. I suppose no one would ever be quite satisfied with another's arrangement of such delicate things as these shades of semantic variation; and I know from personal experience the difficulty of such arrangements. Bender makes 19 semantic divisions, besides a twentieth which includes nine scattering and miscellaneous subheads. Some of these divisions seem based on rather trifling differences of meaning, and it might have been well to use a much smaller number of groups, and to arrange them so as to bring out more clearly their interrelationships.

Part II, dealing with the Avesta, is naturally much shorter, since there are only 190 words (168 in *vant*, 22 in *mant*) which are found. It follows closely in detail the treatment of the Sanskrit suffixes. Interesting is the table (pp. 86-7) of identical words appearing in both Sanskrit and Avestan. Except for the difference in phonetic treatment mentioned above, the Av. brings out little or nothing additional. Its use of the suffixes reveals much narrower semantic limits.

Bender's work is a most valuable contribution to Aryan philology, and is in fact the first serious study that has been made of any Sanskrit suffix on a basis of modern philological scholarship. Its phonetic treatment (which is in this case of overwhelming importance) is especially admirable; I think no doubt will remain in the minds of scholars that he has proved his case as to the relation between the suffixes *mant* and *vant*.

It would take much more space than I have at my disposal to touch adequately upon even the more important of the many interesting problems dealt with in the compressed richness of Dr. Petersen's book of 300 pages. My remarks on it will necessarily be largely eclectic. The subject is a large one, much larger in fact than the rather modest title would indicate; as a matter of fact Petersen takes up in a pretty systematic way the whole of the *-tov* suffix in Classical Greek, and by no means limits himself to semantic considerations, altho they are his main interest. He is commendably generous in his citations of examples, with full passages, under each of his headings, and in the case of the more important semantic divisions his lists claim and appear to be quite exhaustive for Classical Greek. It is perhaps to be regretted that he did not find some way of recording

systematically *every* -*iov* word known to occur, with proper classification; and altho that would have swelled the proportions of the already bulky work, it would have given a touch of completeness and finality to it, and would have also helped other investigators who might wish to look into the suffix for themselves.

P. deals briefly, but, it seems, satisfactorily, with (Ch. II) the euphonic combination of -*io-* with various stem-finals, and (Ch. III) the accent of -*iov* nouns, of which he finds that Chandler's and Allinson's rules will not hold. With Ch. V (p. 15) begins the semantic discussion. In this chapter the author deals with abstract nouns with verbal force; in the next, with abstracts 'expressing an attribute or state', from adjectives. It would seem to me unlikely that the mere fact of these words being used often, or even exclusively, as abstracts justifies their complete separation from the similar nouns which are only found as concretes. Thus, *συνέδριον*, <*συνέδρα*, because it means 'council' as well as 'council chamber', is put here; but *καταγώγιον*, <*καταγωγή*, he puts among place names containing -*iov* as a 'suffix of appurtenance', twenty pages farther on. But whether the concrete or the abstract meaning of *συνέδριον* was more primary, surely the suffix must have been as much a suffix of appurtenance here as with *καταγώγιον*. The two manifestly belong together. And even when a word is found only as an abstract, I see no ground for such a separation. These abstracts might better be made a subhead of the regular suffix of appurtenance. The abstract meaning was probably secondary as a class, tho not in every single word.

In Ch. VIII P. treats -*iov* as a 'suffix of appurtenance', meaning 'belonging to' or 'connected with'. He regards this as the starting point for all the following groups, viz. -*iov* meaning 'coming from' (Ch. IX), meaning 'made of' or 'consisting of' (Ch. X), as a suffix of possession (Ch. XI), meaning 'belonging to the category of, having the nature of' (Ch. XII), meaning 'that which is like, but not equivalent to the primitive' (Ch. XIII), as a deteriorative suffix (XIV), as a diminutive suffix (XV), and as a hypocoristic suffix (XVI). It is now and then a little hard to follow his reasoning. Perhaps it would be better not to try to derive all these meanings from one original, in the case of -*iov*. The reviewer was confronted with an almost identical collection of meanings in the Vedic suffix -*ka* (see his forthcoming article in JAOS Vol. 31), but here the way to a right solution was made plain by the language itself; the oldest Vedic knows *ka* practically only in the sense 'having the nature of', 'similar to', and in the diminutive-pejorative uses, which (as P. rightly shows also for -*iov*) are secondary to that. Accordingly, the suffix *ka*, at least, must have developed the meanings of possession and appurtenance, which it has later, thru the meanings 'having the characteristics of', 'characterized by', 'related to'. This line of development is easily conceivable for the suffix -*iov* also.

But these matters are both highly subjective and of little real importance in comparison with the admirably clear, thorough and illuminating way in which each of the individual semantic divisions is treated by P. The very numerous words under the heading 'appertaining to', etc., are quite properly divided into groups of words with related meanings: place names, plant names, instrument nouns, names of vessels and utensils, etc. The meaning 'coming from', including the patronymics, P. rightly derives from the appurtenance idea, but names for the young of animals [*ὀρνίθιον*, etc.] would better be regarded as diminutives. The meaning 'made of', 'consisting of', he finds rare in the adjectival form (-ιος), it being supplanted by -ειος and -ιος; but the neut. -ιον is common. As a suffix of possession the suffix is rare. I should derive this from the suffix of likeness and characteristic; *αστέριος* 'characterized by stars'; *κόνιος* 'that of which dust is a prominent characteristic, which suggests dust', and so 'having dust'. So with the next category, meaning 'having the nature of, characterized by'; it is, I think, more apt to precede than to follow the idea 'belonging to', and the idea 'being like' is older than the idea 'belonging to the category of'. The words in this class are of two kinds, according as they are of generalizing (*τὰ ἀράχνια*—the members of the genus 'spider') or of specializing meaning; the 'specializing' variety came to be used almost without distinction from the primitive. The author recognizes the difficulty of distinguishing these words (e. g. *ζώνιον*: *ζώνη*) from diminutives; and I should suspect such force in all names of ornaments, small garments, etc., which P. has classed here.—Close to this comes the next division, where -ιος has the meaning 'like (but not equal to)', a fairly numerous class, which serves as a starting point for the deteriorative, diminutive and hypocoristic uses.

Of these, P. is willing to derive the hypocoristic from the diminutive (of size), but vigorously protests against making the deteriorative secondary to the diminutive, or vice-versa. Both, he thinks, are more apt to come independently from the suffix of likeness. I agree with him in this, and have carried out the same thought in my thesis on the Sanskrit *ka*-words; but it did not seem necessary to me to emphasize the fact, and it seems to me that Petersen exaggerates its importance. For after all, all these ideas are very closely related; approximate likeness with failure of perfect identity suggests inferiority, smallness, delicacy, etc., all more or less at once; a suffix which had the first meaning could hardly avoid taking on the others, and even the same word, formed with such a suffix, may and often does appear with different 'diminutive' values in different contexts. P. himself must recognize that the diminutive and pejorative values belong closely together, since he groups them as 'diminutives' (to be sure, always quoting the word) in discussing the time of their

origin (Ch. XVIII). In detail, his account of these groups is instructive, and his collection of examples exhaustive and valuable.

Ch. XVIII, on the time of origin of the 'diminutive' uses, is excellent. He shows, successfully as I think, that the claim of diminutive use for the IE. suffix *-io-*, raised by Brugmann and others, is quite unprovable. The diminutive use of *-io-* in Greek he believes to be later than the epic, and even than the early elegiac and melic poets, whose fragments do not show it. To be sure, Petersen seems to me to overemphasize the absence of diminutive *-io-* in Homer; Homer avoids diminutives altogether, tho some such suffixes must certainly have existed in his time. The most elevated style eschews even 'faded' diminutives, P. to the contrary notwithstanding. P. quotes the German *Mädchen*, and thinks no German poet 'would care, or even be able to avoid' the use of it, 'no matter how elevated his style'. But the fact is, German poets in their elevated moments *do* avoid it. In the text of Wagner's *Walküre* it is used only once (and there consciously, with studied effect), while the poetic 'Maid' occurs 22 times—if my hasty count is correct. Moreover I did not notice a single other occurrence of *-chen* or *-lein* in the play. The use of diminutives by Lucretius (p. 199) does not argue against this; for Lucretius was a philosopher, and the diminutives are a sign of his philosopher's pose,—his contempt for the so-called insignificance of earthly affairs. The same theory is especially noticeable in the writings of the Stoic philosophers, e. g., in the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius, as Professor Gildersleeve has reminded me; nor is the use limited to them. On the general stylistic value of diminutives, see Peppler, *Comic Terminations in Aristophanes*, Baltimore, 1902.—Nevertheless, I think Petersen shows pretty clearly that there is at least no positive reason for thinking that the diminutive use of *-io-* antedates post-Homeric Greek.

The last twelve chapters of the work deal with compound suffixes containing *-io-*. Their origin, by 'clipping' from words in which *-io-* was added to another stem, is fully and satisfactorily treated. The following suffixes are treated: *-διο-* or *-ιδιο-*, whose meanings he finds almost as varied as the simple *-io-*; *-αδιο-*, mostly late and of heterogeneous origin, also widely varying in meaning (only one-third of the words are diminutive); *-υδιο-*, most frequently deteriorative in classical times; *-ακιο-* (only a few scattering examples in classical Greek, not exclusively diminutive); *-ισκιο-*, cf. *-ισκος*, generally diminutive; *-αλ(λ)ιο-* and *-ελ(λ)ιο-*, the former being found in two or three diminutives, the latter probably not really existing; *-υλλιο-*, prevailinglly deteriorative; *-υνιο-* only in *στηθύνιον*, endearing diminutive; *-(δ)αριο-*, most commonly diminutive; **-υριο-*, wrongly set up by Schwabe as an independent suffix; *-ασιο-* < IE. *-t(i)on*, rarely diminutive; *-αφιο-*, *-ηφιο-*, *-φιο-* and *-υφιο-* (the first being the commonest), prevailinglly diminutive.

Again I must give expression to my deep sense of the impossibility of doing justice to Dr. Petersen's very scholarly and admirable work in such a limited review. Perhaps no one who does not know by experience the laboriousness of this kind of suffix study could fully appreciate the enormous amount of industry, thought and care which the author has put into his subject, and the results of which show on every page. Tho one may be allowed to differ with him now and then on more or less abstract questions of derivation of meanings, this does not in any way detract from the value of the rich collections of material or the careful sifting of them.

(NOTE.—On p. 110 Petersen quotes Sanskrit *maryakā* as meaning 'manikin'. But the word means '*Männchen*' in the sense of 'male animal, bull', a wholly different idea. The Pet. Lex. gives this meaning, which some later interpreters have unwisely abandoned. See JAOS 31, part 2, p. 149.)

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK,
Vol. XV (dedicated to Professor Bücheler on the completion
of his fiftieth year as Doctor of Philosophy). First Part.

Pp. 1-9. K. Brugmann, *Senex Iuuenis*. The IG. form of the former is *sen-os, with which we may directly connect Lat. senior, seneo and senesco. The change from an original o-stem and the use of senex as a substantive were due to the influence of iuuenis. The nom. senex, which is allied to senecio, senecta and senectus, may well be due to the awkwardness of a nom. *so, which the analogy of the original nom. *iuvo would give, but the stem senec- yielded to seni- through the influence of iuveni-. Conversely seni- influenced iuveni- in preventing the regular change to iuvini-. The study closes with a tribute to the Senex iuuenis of Bonn, to whom the volume is dedicated.

10-22. E. Wölfflin, *Die Sprache des Claudius Quadrigarius*. An examination of the views of Gellius on this subject in Noct. Att. XVII. 2. The language of Quad. has little that is more archaic than would be expected in the time of Sulla. There is little or no conscious effort for archaism, such as appears in Sallust. He has many characteristics of the poetic style, drawn from the epic and tragic poets, and occasionally from comedy and satire, especially a freer use of the collective singular and the poetic plural. He extended the sphere of the abl. abs.

23-29. H. Peter, *Zur Textesgeschichte der Scriptores historiae Augustae*. An examination of the attempt of E. Patzig (Byz. Zeitschr. XIII. 44-50) to get additional material, independent of cod. P, from the second edition of the Scriptores (Venice, 1489), with an unfavorable verdict.

30-33. Fr. Vollmer, *Lexikalisches aus Horaz*. In Carm. 4. 4. 36 would read indecorant; in 3. 6. 10, inauspicatus, a form of compound of which H. was very fond; in 3. 29. 24 aequore = "smooth river-bed"; in 3. 24. 4 terrenum omne = "the whole mainland"; in 3. 14. 19 would read vagacem, from vagax.

34-54. F. Skutsch, *Zur lateinischen Syntax*. An attempt to apply the methods of phonology and morphology to syntax, especially the influence of analogy. 1. The use of substantives as adjectives. This occurs not only in exercitus victor, etc., but vetus (*Fēros*) and uber (*oððap*) were originally substantives. On the analogy of felicia arma, arma victricia appears in poetry (first

in Vergil), then *ultricia*, etc. 2. Use of cases. The use of the nom. for the voc. is sometimes due to metrical reasons, but not always. It was extended by analogy to the o-declension from the others, in which the form of the nom. and the voc. were the same, first in such combinations as *meus pullus passer*. The use of the partitive gen. with *affatim*, *largiter*, etc. arose from analogy with its use with *parum*, *multum* and other forms which were identical with the neuter sing. of adjectives, with which the part. gen. would regularly be used. *Foras* and *foris* point to an original paradigm **forae*, -arum. *Foras* was an acc. of limit of motion, and *foris*, originally meaning "at the door" came to mean "outside the door". *Fores*, -ium is due to the analogy of *aedes*, -ium. *Hic clarior est quam ille* (instead of *illo*) is due to the analogy of *hic tam clarus est quam ille*. 3. *Refert*. This verb and *interest* affected each other by analogy. *Meā*, *tuā*, etc. belong to *refert*; *multum*, *plus*, *plurimum* and the double question to *interest*. After examining the different theories as to *rē*-, which has been regarded as nom., dat., abl., and acc. plur., S. decides for the nominative, since *fert* is not used impersonally. The *ā* in *meā*, etc., is due to the fact that *rē*- was taken for an abl.

55-62. O. Hey, *Aus dem kaiserlichen Kanzleistil*. Such an expression as *edicensum putavi* means *edixi quia necessarium putavi*, and is apologetic. The use occurs in Cic. and Caes. and is very common in the later juristic Latin. Here two forms appear: the first person (pluralis maiestatis), where the emperor speaks of himself, and the third (more rarely the second) person, mostly in conditions, with reference to punishable offences. These uses can be explained only on the assumption that frequent use had disguised the original meaning, so that such phrases had become simple expressions of will. *Hegesippus* has a liking for this construction and uses it in many cases where *Josephus* used the simple verb. This does not affect the question of the identity of *Ambrosius* with the translator of *Josephus' Bell. Jud.*, since *Ambrosius* and other contemporary writers use the construction, and it may be assumed that A. used it more frequently in his younger days.

62. E. Wölfflin, *Fatidicus*. Would read this word for **facitidia* in *Donatus* on *Verg. Aen. 6. 180 ff.* (p. 533. 19, Georg.).

63-73. M. Ihm, *Die Apicius-Exzerpte im codex Salmasianus*. Text, with explanatory and critical notes. These excerpts are distinct from the ten books of the *ars coquinaria*.

74-87. Th. Birt, *Einiges, was uns die Handschriften lehren*. Evidence from the *Palat. codd.* of *Plautus* for *hoccine*, which by false analogy gave *hicce*, *hucce*, *huncce*. *Etquis* for *ecquis* should be allowed to stand in the texts. The dat. form *quo* is attested for Cic. *Verg. Sen.* and in an inscription in *Carm. Epigr. 420. 1 f.*; also in *Plautus* and *Varro*.

2 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
2 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
2 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
2 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
2 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

88. Fr. Marx, *Fefellitus sum*. A defence of this form, read by Bücheler in Petr. 61. 8, and of *pepertus*.

89-105. R. Heinze, *Supplicium*. The word is used of other punishments than those by death. In Plautus the word implies a personal injury, to be atoned for by punishment or by fine, by way of satisfaction to an individual. It meant first the appeal for reconciliation, then the punishment. When the Law determined the punishment, the foreign word *poena* was used. *Supplicium* is applied to a public enemy only when conquered and begging for mercy. *Supplicium sumere* and *supplicio adicere* usually mean punishment by death, but not always; for example in Sall. Cat. 60, where it is expressly stated that death is not meant.

105. L. Havet, *Deformare*. Would read *deformat* (*deforet*) for *deferat* in Lucil. 1191, Marx. The word is derived from *fori* as *deponere* from *pons*.

106-112. E. Hauler, *Lepturgus, chirurgus* u. ä. bei Fronto. In *Quid? si quis postulare... aut Calamis Turena aut Polyc(l)etus Etrusca*, p. 113. 1, Naber, would read for *turena*, *lepturgata* (the palimpsest has 10 letters); cf. *λεπτοουργεῖν* of products of the fine arts in Plut. vit. Aem. Paul. 37; or perhaps *lepturga*. For Etrusca H. would read *chirurgia*, in the sense of manual work, that of the artisan as opposed to that of the artist.

113-120. W. F. Otto, *Mania und Lares*. In Varro, *Sculixes* (463 Büch.) *suspendit Laribus marinas mollis pila, reticula ac strophia*, we should read *manias* for *marinas*, with Meursius. The *maniae* were not dolls, for which the word is *pupae*, but were bogies or hobgoblins. On account of *strophia* the line can not refer to offerings made by a maiden passing into womanhood, but may perhaps refer to offerings before marriage. The *Lares* are connected with death and the underworld.

121-128. M. Pokrowskij, *Zum Thesaurus Glossarum emendatarum* von G. Götz. Notes on a number of passages. Discussion of the confusion of *de-* and *dis-* in the glosses.

128-137. E. Lommatzsch, *Zur lateinischen Orthographie: ei für i auf lateinischen Inschriften der Kaiserzeit*. This is confined to a few definite cases, especially the plur. of the second decl. It is common at the beginning of the period, but soon diminishes and finally disappears except in some stereotyped forms. The archaists under Claudius and in the second century attempted to restore *ai*, but the use of *ei* for *i* does not increase during those periods.

138. E. Lommatzsch, *Zu CARM. EPIGR. n. 2*. In b, line 2 reads *ad veitam*; in 3, *AASTVTIEIS*; in 4 the only possible reading is *sai(pi)sume*; in 5 the punctuation *imperat. oribus* is certain.

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

139-143. A. Brinkmann, *Simpuvium*—*simpulum*. Both these words are used of a vase corresponding to the Greek *κύαθος*. The former is the original name, while the latter is a corruption of late times.

144-146. Miscellen. W. M. Lindsay, *Hercules*, 5 Dekl. A discussion of the declension of personal names in -es in Plautus.

F. Skutsch, *Persōna*. Believes it to be a borrowed word from Etruscan *persu*, = Lat. **persō*, -*ōnis*, whence *persōnare* and *persōna*. This view is in harmony with that of the Etruscan origin of the Roman drama.

A. Becker, *Zur Aussprache des C*. See Hey, *ALL. XIV.* 112 (A. J. P. XXXI. 345). In pseud.-Quint. decl. mai. the usage in alliteration shows a varying pronunciation, pointing to a period of transition. This supports the view of Hammer that the declamationes were of Gallic origin and belong to the middle of the second century.

147-152. Review of the Literature for 1905. 1906.

153-163. Th. Birt, *Doppelformen im Lateinischen*. Regards the following as doublets: *elementum* and *alimentum*; the former occurs in good writers, with assimilation as in *similis*, *semel*, *fescennini*, *fascinum*: *coitus* and *coetus*; the former is dissyllabic in *Lucr.* 2. 1061: *vafer* and *faber*; *fabre* = *vafre* occurs in *Plaut.*, while *fabrica* and *fabricare* have the meaning of cunning device, devise cunningly: *nevel* and *neve*; the former can not be read in *Hor. Sat.* 2. 5. 89, with some of the best MSS., for metrical reasons: *phydrio* for *phrygio*; this orthography is ancient and has an analogy in Greek: *alter* and *adulter*; *alter* = *adulter* in *Plaut. Miles* 288 and 320, and in *Prop.*; *adalteratum* in *Sen. Epist.* 97. 5 (cod. *Argent.*).

164. L. Brichta, *Zur Enallage adiectivi*. An additional example from *Ov. Am.* 3. 7. 21 (see *ALL. XIV.* 105 ff.; A. J. P. XXXI 345).

164. J. Denk, *Fraumentum* = *fragmentum*. A sure example from *Acta Apost. apocrypha* of Lipsius (*Act. Petri cum Simone*, cap. 11, p. 59. 17), of the same epoch as *Dracontius* in whose *Laud. dei* 3. 715 Vollmer adopted the form from cod. *Brux. saec. XII.* In *Sall. Hist.* 3. 54 (*Nonius*) *frumentis* is doubtful.

165-211. H. Christiansen, *Que—que bei den römischen Hexametrikern* (bis etwa 500 n. Chr.). For the most part we find two words connected in this way, generally substantives. No cases of more than two words are found with adjectives and adverbs, and but two with verbs. With substantives the cases are more frequent, but the usage is rare. It was introduced from Homer by Ennius, but contrary to Homer's practice the usual place in Latin is after the caesura.

Special rules were developed in Latin with regard to elision, lengthening, etc., which were in general carefully observed.

212. O. Probst, Zu Lucrez 4. 990. Would complete the verse with the words *edere vocem*.

212. C. Weyman, *Malus vel pravus*. This is the correct order in *Regula S. Benedicti*, 4, instead of *pravo vel malo* of cod. *Oxoniensis*; cf. *Sall. Cat.* 5. 1 *malus pravusque*. *Vel* = *et*, as often in *Benedict*.

213-221. J. Wackernagel, *Qua—qua. Lympha. Eruptum* = *ereptum*. In *Plautus* *qua—qua* is nearly equal to *et—et*. It is avoided by *Terence*, but was retained in colloquial Latin. It is not indefinite, but relative, and originated in *qua—qua potest*. *Lympha* is Gk. *λύμφη*, and not from Italic **dumpā*. *Lucilius'* *limpor* is a contamination of *liquor* and *lympa*. *Eruptum* = *ereptum* should be retained as an archaism in *Apul. de Mag.* 28 (p. 33. 19, Helm).

221-222. A. Döring, *Pontifex. Kalendae. Idus. Etymologien*. The first is from **spontifex* (cf. *spondeo* and *sponte*) since the *pontifex* was called upon to officiate when the ordinary citizen was not *suave spontis* (cf. *Cels.* 1. 1), the last cognate with *αἶθω*, *aedes*. *Kalendae* is not from *calare*, but from *cal* in *oculo*, *clam*, and *celo*, the "dark of the moon".

223-232. E. Bednara, *Aus der Werkstatt der daktylischen Dichter*. A continuation of the articles in *ALL.* XIV. 317 ff. and 532 ff. (*A. J. P.* XXXI 349). A collection of new forms used by the dactylic poets which gave two short syllables, or at least one, from *Catonis Disticha*, *Ovid's Amores* and *Ex Ponto I*, including those taken over from the earlier poets.

233-252. P. Geyer, *Die wirkliche Verfasserin der "Peregrinatio Silviae"*. A notice of *Férotin's Le véritable auteur de la Peregrinatio Silviae, la vierge espagnole Éthéria*, Paris, 1903 and *Anglade, De latinitate libelli qui inscriptus est Peregrinatio ad loca sancta*. Accepts the former's conclusion that the work was composed by *Éthéria* between 378 and 388. The work, however, shows more indications of Gallic than of Spanish Latin.

252. P. Geyer, *Pullus* = *gallus*. Additional examples of this use.

253-260. E. Wölfflin, *Die Interpretationes Vergilianae des Claudius Donatus*. The commentary contains explanations of poetic expressions and metaphors, and of syntactical constructions. Antiquities are neglected, as usual until *Serv. Danielis*. The treatise is highly rhetorical.

260. C. Weyman, *Caput unguento deducere*. This expression, from *Paul. Nol. Epist.* XIII. 7, p. 90. 13, may be explained by the analogy of *crinem unguento deducere*; cf. *Stat. Silv.*

1. 2. 111 f. It is not necessary to assume a contamination of two constructions, as W. did in *Révue d'hist. et de litt. relig.* III (1898), 565.

261-274. A. Klotz, *Die Argumente zur Thebais des Statius*. Text with critical apparatus and notes on metre and language. The argumenta were written in Gaul between the fourth and the sixth centuries.

274. C. Weyman, *Habeat, teneat, possideat*. This legal formula occurs in *Plin. Epist.* 1. 16. 1.

275-283. Miscellen. O. Hey, *Noch einmal Actutum.—Actuarius*. While admitting the possibility of a derivation from *agere*, H. defends his etymology suggested in *ALL.* XI. 35 (*AJP.* XXIX. 354) against M. Pokrowskij, *Rh. M.* LXI. 185, citing examples from vulgar Latin of the change of *act-* to *att-(at-)*. The citation of *actuarius* by P. as evidence for the idea of speed in *ago* is a mistaken one; a better one would be *age (agite)*.

C. Weyman, *Sine ira et studio*. This phrase from *Tac. Ann.* 1. 1, which Leo, *Griechisch-römische Biographie*, p. 313, would find in Eusebius of Caesarea, is not parallel with the expression of Eusebius, and besides is not original with Tacitus.

K. Hoppe, *Vergiliana*. Corrections of Georgii, *Die antike Aeneiskritik* and *Die antike Vergilkritik in den Bukolika und Georgika*, with notes on glosses which throw light on the scholia to Vergil.

M. Wisén, *Zum historischen Infinitiv*. Originally a perfect form. *Amare*, for example, was related to *amavere* as *amarunt* is to *amaverunt*. It was used in colloquial Latin, and its origin was lost sight of. This view explains the use of the *nom.* as subject and the fact that the *hist. inf.* is commonly found in the present active.

284-294. Review of the Literature for 1906. 1907.

295. Necrology. W. v. Hartel.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

PHILOLOGUS, Bd. LXVIII (N. F. Bd. XXII), 1909.

I, pp. 1-51. L. Jeep, *Priscianus*. Continued from Vol. LXVII, pp. 21-51. Contributions to the history of the transmission of Roman literature. Priscian probably owes most of his citations from the oldest Latin literature to Fl. Caper whom he freely excerpted.

II, pp. 52-70. W. Gilbert, *Der zweite Teil des Logos der Diotima in Platons Gastmahl* (cap. 24-29, pag. 204 C—212 A.).

These chapters develop the working (*ἔργα*) and uses (*χρεία*), that is, the aim of Love, while in the preceding chapters its attributes and appearance are treated. In this article the course of thought is first sketched and then certain points are illustrated. I. The wider meaning (*εἶναι*) and narrower use (*καλεῖσθαι*) of the word *ἔρως*, c. 24-25. II. The Eros of a Socrates is the real subject, the Eros of the great teacher, a yearning after spiritual immortality without belief in the hereafter. From this followed as the peculiarity of the Symposium; (1) in place of transcendental immortality of the soul, (relative) earthly immortality must be substituted. (2) The Eros of the philosopher must proceed genetically out of the Eros of the teacher, yet in such a way that the former is to be conceived from the very beginning, nay, in physical attraction to the beautiful person, as the chiefly unconscious though real goal of endeavor for the man as he struggles in his mysterious desire. (3) The dialectic conceptual development could be given only for an *ἔρως ἀθανασίας* without belief in a hereafter (through *τόκος ἐν καλῷ*) whereas it could not suit the pure Platonic *ἔρως*. Whether for this also the way of conceptual development is at least hinted, is a question to be raised later.

III, pp. 71-87. Th. Stangl, Bobiensia. New contributions to the scholia Bobiensia of Cicero. The additions of the second hand in the Vatican leaves originate from a manuscript. In about a dozen passages in the Miloniana corrections are made in a sixth century semi-uncial. The words which are supplied were omitted by the first copyist owing to a homoioteleuton.

IV, pp. 88-117. G. Friedrich, Zu Martial. In Spect. 21, 8 read: haec tamen, haec res est facta ita, ficta alia. In I 67, 2 read: in te qui dicit, Ceryle: 'liber homo est'? IV 25, 6 read: haurit. Punctuate IV 58, 1, in tenebris luges amissum, Galla. maritum? In V 24, 13 read: casside lucida. V 38, 3 read: seca . . . μέριζε. In V 78, 31 with Claudiam supply cenam, and interpret like Hor. Epp. I 5, 27, priorem = taking place earlier. In VI 14, 4 retain non scribat, as in I praef. and I 55, 13. In VI 58, 2 read: sidera ferre. Interpret VII 73 by starting from the Aventine (hinc v. 3). There are three houses, three prospects. Illinc (v. 3) is from the Esquiline; then follows a chiasitic order. In VIII 51, 21—as Martial pronounced Instanti as though it were Istanti, he can say in v. 25 that he would drink seven not eight cyathi as a toast. In IX 61, 5 aedibus in mediis = cavaedium: vss. 13-14 should be read between 12 and 15: vs. 17 refers to a visit of host and guests to the place of banqueting. In XII 21, 7 read: nec cito; in V 82, 4 ni tu, dispeream, Gaure, etc.; in VIII 30, 7 read: quod si rapta; in XII 32, 12 read: corneaue laterna. XIII 65 refers to the partridge.

V, pp. 118-151. R. Eisler, Kuba-Kybele. Comparative investigations in the history of the religion of Asia Minor. The

cultnames (Ka'aba Χαμάρ, Χαβάρ, etc.) must once have been spread through the whole domain of west-semitic civilization and contain the key to the understanding of the name as well as the original nature of the great Mother of the gods of Asia Minor. A suggestive series of etymologies and parallels is given. The discussion is continued pp. 161-209.

Miscellen.

1. pp. 152-154. G. Lippold. *Mythographisches*. The fragment from Herculaneum (Coll. alt. VIII 105) contains a new authority for Epicurean polemic against the mythological tradition and for estimating the value of the "mythological manual".

2. pp. 154-157. W. Soltau, 'Ρῶμος und Remus. Remus is neither a linguistic nor arbitrary differentiation of 'Ρῶμος. As the older Romulus (of the recorded first foundation of Rome) received as brother a Rōmos, so the later Romulus received Rēmos. This was too subtle for the Greeks who remained content with their 'Ρῶμος καὶ 'Ρωμύλος. Naevius could not use the rejected Romos so he had to choose a new name for the twin brother.

3. pp. 157-160. P. Maas, Kurz- und Langzeile in der Auspicianischen Strophe. The type is: Rex aeternae domine rerum creator domine qui es ante secula semper cum patre filius. In several of these hymns the first and third short lines are handled more freely than the second and fourth. Examples are given where this fact is important in restoring the text.

VI, pp. 161-209, R. Eisler, Kuba-Kybele. Enough agreement between the Kybele cult of Asia Minor and the Arabian Ka'aba cult has been proved to set in a new light the part taken by the semitic element in the heterogeneous civilization of Asia Minor.

VII, pp. 210-228, W. Schultz. 'Εφέσια und Δελφικά γράμματα. Starting from Roscher's analysis in *Philol.* LX (1901), p. 81 ff., the writer establishes a parallelism in the number of letters in the sayings and verses; in the inner symmetry of the arrangement on the basis of which they are counted; and in the numerical symbolism and division of the component parts, that is to say, the number of letters in both series is a multiple of the number of parts and the number sacred to the particular divinity, i. e., the 7 of Apollo, the 6 of Artemis. The Ephesian letters form an hexameter:

αἴσια δαμνεμενὺς τέτραξ λίξ ἄσκι κατάσκι.

The philosophy of Heraclitus of Ephesus affords a commentary on these detached words: The fiery sun who subdues the universe (δαμνεμενὺς) calls forth in the fourfold seasons (τέτραξ) upon earth (λίξ) the alternation of night (ἄσκι) and day (κατάσκι); for this is true (αἴσια).

VIII, pp. 229-259. C. Ritter, Die politischen Grundanschauungen Platons, dargestellt im Anschluss an die Politeia. A clearly written outline of the chief points of the Republic, put in rather free order to emphasize the relative importance of several hitherto almost neglected characteristics.

IX, pp. 260-270. Th. Steinwender, Der Quincunx im römischen Heere zur Zeit der Manipularstellung. There really was a quincunx formation in the line of scrimmage within certain limits, but not a quincunx of manipulares.

X, pp. 271-317. O. Haberleitner, Studien zu den Acta imperatorum Romanorum. I. The formulas in the edicts and letters of the emperors from Augustus to Hadrian. The acta were of seven kinds. I. Private letters, II (a) edicta (b) orationes (c) adlocutiones, III (a) epistulae (of public nature) (b) rescripta (c) subscriptiones, IV (a) decreta (b) interlocutiones (II, III, IV were called *constitutiones*), V mandata, VI leges datae, VII privilegia militum veteranorumque de civitate et conubio. The writer discusses the transmission, publication, collection, the internal peculiarities of each class of documents.

Miscellen.

4. p. 318, C. E. Gleye, Die Weltkarte des Agrippa. He would propose in Plin. N. H. 3, 17 ex delineatione for ex destinatione.

5. p. 319-320. O. Probst, Zu Martial III 58, 12 pp., picta perdix must be the fowl called *attagen*.

XI, pp. 321-331. J. Sitzler, Der Koer Kadmos. Kadmos of Kos (Herod. VII 163) was the son of Skythes, tyrant of Kos, who became later ruler of Zankle in Sicily, of which the Samians took possession in 493 B. C. Before Skythes left Kos he passed his throne over to his son Kadmos. This probably occurred about the time of the beginning of the Ionian revolt. Later Kadmos succeeded in restoring the Samians, who had formerly been driven out of Zankle by Anaxilas.

XII, pp. 332-343. C. Ritter, Platonica. The writer considers several points which he passed over in his larger work on the life and writings of Plato (Neue Untersuchungen über Platon), points resulting from his study of the so-called Platonic letters.

(1) Although Epist. XIII is spurious, the allusion to Plato's nieces is likely to be correct, as they would be well known at Athens, when the letter was presumably written. The statement (Diog. Laert. III 2 f. and Index Herculensis Col. II 33 ff.) that Plato died at a feast is corroborated, thinks Ritter, by a scholium in the Hercul. Pap., from which he conjectures that the feast was the wedding of his niece.

(2) Comparing Alkiphron IV 7 (Schepers) and Plut. Mor. 59 b, Ritter is inclined to emend ὡς περ κοχλίας to ὑπὲρ κροτάφους in the

lines of Amphis (Diog. L. III 28) describing the severe look of Plato.

(3) The portrait-busts of Plato. We do not know today how Plato really looked.

XIII, pp. 344-367. S. Eitrem, *De Mercurio Aristophaneo*. The purpose of the writer is to convince scholars that in his portraying of Hermes, Aristophanes has faithfully expressed the divine nature of the god even in minor details, has upon occasions turned the epithets of the divinity to his own use, and has pictured a Hermes quite after the fancy of the Athenians, as the servant of the Olympians. He has also borrowed somewhat from Aeschylus and the author of the Homeric hymn, and possibly portions of an older comedy.

XIV, pp. 368-395. O. Gilbert, *Aristoteles und die Vorsokratiker*. Diels, in his *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, did not include opinions which are not referred by Aristotle to particular philosophers. But it is important to establish that Aristotle aims to characterize sharply the several schools according to their peculiar teachings, and so to place the different theories side by side. So the Ionians, Eleatics, Pythagoreans, Atomists, Platonics appear as closed schools; but Empedokles and Anaxagoras appear everywhere as the heads of two schools. In this article Gilbert collects the general opinions of Aristotle on the older schools. The doctrines here treated are those that serve to establish their view of the world and conception of Nature.

These views fall into two categories: I. *μία ἀρχή* (i. e. the *ὅλη* absolutely) either (1) *κινουμένη* or (2) *ἀκίνητος*. II. *πλείους ἀρχαί* (i. e. the *ὅλη* from the beginning divided *κατὰ φύσιν*). (1) In limited number (2, 3, or 4) or (2) in unlimited number (*ἄπειροι*) and these last (*ἄπειροι*) again either (a) *τὸ γένος ἓν* or (b) *ἐναντία*. Before Aristotle no one correctly treated of purpose. For Aristotle insists that the idea of purpose to which as to the highest principle all cosmic being is subject can be explained only from the distinction of a transitory and an intransitory world. The failure to make such a distinction is the vital error from which according to Aristotle's judgment the whole pre-Socratic philosophy suffers.

XV, pp. 396-409. M. Manitius, *Erchanberts von Freising Donatkommentar*. He was bishop in 835-853 and this work of his seems to be earlier than Hraban's grammar. Although no new grammatical sources are to be gained from this Donatus commentary, yet it is worth closer examination because of the interest in such studies in the South among the East Franks, and because of the treatment of the sources. He had a larger body of source-material at his disposal than had Hraban, whose work rests chiefly on Priscian, Diomedes and Beda.

XVI, pp. 411-427. F. Reuss, *Der erste punische Krieg*. A defence of his statements in *Philol. N. F. XIV*, 102-148, about the origin of our tradition concerning the first Punic War, and certain chronological arguments, which had been assailed by Varese, Beloch, Schermann, Eliaeson, Luterbacher and Leuze.

XVII, pp. 428-444. W. Aly, *Karer und Leleger*. An attempt to establish the Greek tradition about these peoples from the literary material and support it by archaeological data, as a step towards helping to unravel the ethnological problem presented by the Cretan-Mycenaean civilization. The Carians came to the mainland from the islands; for of old as subjects of Minos under the name "Leleges", they had occupied the islands. Although an original relationship of Cretans and Leleges with the people of Asia Minor cannot be denied, the bond was early broken. Only Lycia, Labraunda, Troas, Tenedos et al. appear to be remains of the ancient stock.

Miscellen.

6. pp. 445-446. P. Maas, *ῥδάτη*. In the boat song from Oxyrhynchus vs. 4, the reading is shown by the meter to be correct; for the meter, the same as in a 4th cent. baptismal hymn, requires a final paroxytone and almost all final syllables are long. From this identity of meter we get light on the fact that Areios disseminated his religious ideas in boat-songs, miller-songs and the like.

7. pp. 446-447. J. Baunack, *Zu Thuk. I 24, 3*. The reading ἀπελθόντες, with or without ἐπ' οἴκου can mean ἐπανελθόντες. μετὰ τῶν βαρβάρων belongs to both verbal ideas in the sentence and Thuk. has condensed from: οἱ δὲ ἀπελθόντες ἀπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐπ' οἴκου μετὰ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐλγίζοντο τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει.

8. pp. 447-448. M. Schneider, *Zu Vergils Eclog. I 59, 60*. The reading *aequore* for aethere is paralleled by Archilochus (ap. Stob. *Florileg.* CX 10 = Bergk P. L. G⁴, 74, 31) which is probably the original for Vergil: δελφίνες corresponds to *pisces*; θῆρες to *cervi*; ἡπειρος and ὄρος to *in litore* and νομός ἐνάλιος and ἡχέεντα κύματα to an *in aequore* in Vergil. Cf. also the imitation in Nemesianus *Eclog. I 75 freto*.

XVIII, pp. 449-455. L. Radermacher, *Griechischer Sprachbrauch* (cf. *Philologus* LXV, N. F. XIX 142 ff.).

18. ἐν ἐπιφανεστάτῳ in Bechtel, *Sammlung der gr. Dialektinschriften* 3380 Z 12 = ἐπιφανέστατα. Cf. Philostrat. *Vita Apollon.* V 29, p. 96 and VII, 11, p. 111. The use of the plural is slightly different in Oxyr. Pap. III 478, 34 ἐν ὑπερετίσιν 'at the age of more than sixty years'; the plural makes it easier. The Hellenistic εἰαυτῷ = "für sich" also occurs as ἐν εἰαυτῷ in the prooemium of the book of Sirach.

19. Two Ionisms. *πολλόν* with a comparative is correct in Phoenix of Colophon ap. Athen. 530 E and Soph. Ant. 86. In Soph. Oed. Col. 1135 read *ἐμπήρους* with Hense. As an obiter dictum, Eurip. Troad. 1331 is emended to *ἰώ, τάλαινα, μολις ὁμως δὲ πρόφερε πόδα*, etc.

20. In the poem of Antipatros in Oxyr. Pap. IV 662 Col. III *αὐτονέον δέρμα* means 'das Ideal eines frischen Fells'. *αὐτό* through influence of philosophic terminology came to have the meaning of 'concept' among later writers, cf. Lucian diall. meretr. 14, 4 *ἔνος αὐτὸ λυρίζων*; and Alciphron III 24, 2 *αὐτὸ σκαπανεύς ἐδόκουν*.

XIX, pp. 456-463. Eb. Nestle, Spiritus asper und lenis in der Umschreibung hebräischer Wörter. The subject needs thorough investigation. That Abraham and Abimelech, both beginning with aleph, should appear in Greek, the former with smooth, the latter with rough breathing, is due to the fact that in the latter case the aspiration has passed from the middle of the word to the initial vowel; so from Jehuda we have (*ουχ*) *Ἰουδα* in the MSS. Nestle then considers hallelujah and hosanna, both of which in Greek should have the spiritus lenis. A more thorough study from a complete collection of data is needed.

XX, pp. 464-487. A. Müller, Die Neujahrsfeier im römischen Kaiserreiche. A most entertaining study of the ancient New Year's Day celebrations; the shift from March 1 to Jan. 1 with the change of calendar and induction of magistrates; the sources for the study, isolated passages in earlier writers, copious references from Ovid down, especially detailed accounts in the fourth century from Church fathers who combated the popular fondness for secular amusements. All ranks of society indulged in this festival in almost every sort of merrymaking from presents (*strenae*) and calls of congratulation, to antics, mummary and superstitious rites.

XXI, pp. 488-499. W. Schultz, Herakles am Scheidewege. (1) This story is an alphabetical allegory which receives its peculiar coloring and its relation to older myths through traditions respecting the invention of the alphabet. (2) The institution of the Ephebia seems to have presupposed an arrangement of four periods of life of 20 years each, corresponding to the four seasons, and was then brought into connection with the numerical symbolism of the alphabetic series. (3) The history of the *litera Pythagorica vel philosophica* affords a glimpse into an hitherto obscure Pythagorean legend which was affected by Etruscan influence. (4) The letter Y acquired an association already current in mythology of 'path of life' and 'tree of life'. In the peculiar form in which it mediates between the traditions about the *litera Pythagorica* and those on which Prodicus' allegory is based, it is suited to make a new link in the chain which connects the Etruscans in Italy and the Lydians in Asia Minor.

XXII, pp. 500-522. K. Bitterauf. Die Bruchstücke des Anonymus Iamblichi. The writer is a sophist whose ethical and political philosophy corresponds to that of the Prometheus myth in the Protagoras. This myth is taken to be not a free creation of Plato, but an exploitation of some existing document. The Abderite Protagoras may have been the author. The claims of other sophists are considered and set aside.

XXIII, pp. 523-528. A. Ruppertsberg, Ueber zwei Horazstellen. (1) *Relicta non bene parmula* in Carm. II 7, may be taken literally. It is shown that Roman officers did carry shields. Horace might console himself for the loss and his own fright by thinking of the experiences of Archilochus, Alcaeus and Anacreon. We can pardon the weakness shown by a twenty-three year old youth under the stress of an overpowering fate. But we should stop giving the poet's words an artificial sense, Lessing, Kiessling, Aly, and others to the contrary notwithstanding.

(2) In Carm. II 18, 38 ff., *hic levare functum pauperem laboribus . . . vocatus atque non vocatus audit*, he emends to *audet* = *cupit*, *vult*, *dignatur*. This certainly seems to remove the obvious difficulties of the passage.

XXIV, pp. 529-536. K. Hartmann, Das Verhältnis des Lucretius Carus zur Musik. Lucretius may be classed as a man of strong musical temperament, though perhaps without technical knowledge of the art. His references to music from the songs of birds to the organ are passed in review.

XXV, pp. 537-549. W. Anderson, Zu Apuleius' Novelle vom Tode der Charite (Met. VIII c. 1-14). The original form of the story seems to be in a Tatar-Caucasian version, closely connected with which are two Armenian variants, another Tschetschenian, and two stories in Plutarch *Mulier. virtut. s. Κάμψα* and *Amator. 22* (ed. Bernardakis II, p. 234-236; IV, p. 452 sq.). The Kriemhild saga in the second half of the Nibelungenlied is quite similar also. The hypothesis of Maass and Bürger that Apuleius has contaminated the Protesilaos saga in the Euripidean Version with the Atyslegend (Herodot. I 34-45) goes too far in the light of the Plutarch passages, although Apul. may have borrowed single motives from Euripides.

XXVI, pp. 550-559. O. Probst, Glossen aus Cassius Felix. Striking comparison of the garbled glosses in *Hermeneumata Cod. Vatic. 1260 Saec. X* (Corp. Gloss. ed. Goetz, III, p. 549 sqq.) with Cassius Felix.

XXVII, pp. 560-568. D. Heeringa, Noch einmal de Divinatione. Sander's hypothesis of an anonymous editor after Cicero's death (*Quaestiones de Cic. libris quos scripsit de Div. 1908*) is superfluous. His notion that Cicero had originally planned but a single book de Div. is refuted by de Fato 1.

Miscellen.

9. pp. 569-572. J. Sundwall, Zwei attische Dekrete. (1) Nr. 375 in the Mus. at Athens, of the 3d cent., an honorary decree for the astynomoi who had merited praise for a procession. (2) Inv. nr. 387, first cent. decree in honor of the prytanies and their magistrates.

10. pp. 572-573. W. Weyh, Astrologisches in der griechisch-orthodoxen Liturgie? A comparison of catal. cod. Graec. astr. IV 99 with the Parakletike would seem to point to the latter's having influenced the former, rather than *vice versa*.

11. pp. 573-575. K. Lincke, Zu Demokritos *περί εὐθυμίας*. In frg. 3 Diels, 163 Natorp for *αἰπεῖσθαι*, read *αἰρεσθαι*.

12. pp. 575-577. K. Preisendanz, Zum Pariser Zauberpapyrus der bibl. nat. suppl. gr. 574. The separate leaves now glued into book-form were originally double leaves which became separated, when the middle of the papyrus broke.

13. p. 578. B. A. Müller, Zu Lycophrons Nachleben. Two misstatements in Christ's Hdbch. d. gr. Litt. are corrected. Jos. Scaliger's translation was first printed in 1566 at Basel, and it was Reichard who imitated Lycophron's poem in his edition of 1788.

14. p. 579. O. Crusius, *Vetulam facere* und die *dies vetulae*. The former = vitulam f. and refers to masquerading as a calf; the latter refers to Anna Perenna, the goddess of the year.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

BRIEF MENTION.

Some titles carry with them the pith of the whole sermon, the whole essay that they head. So Dr. Chalmers' 'Expulsive Power of a New Affection', though to be sure 'clavus clavum pellit' would have answered as well. So Lowell's 'On a Certain Condescension in Foreigners'—a title that often comes up to my mind when those who are not professional Hellenists patronize Greek, while they revile the methods by which alone the inner shrine of Hellenism can be reached. Given a little facile eloquence, even a little journalistic deftness, and anybody can say pretty things about Greek, as anybody can say pretty things about Mpongwe. Years ago I declined to be under everlasting obligations to Du Bois-Reymond when he made amends for his assault on Greek exercises (Essays and Studies, p. 57) by a generous recognition of the 'world-riddles' that the Greek propounded for the first time and for all time. My heartstrings are rusty and do not vibrate to such fingerings. So the other day I was stopped in the street by a friend who informed me with genuine sympathy that a famous literary physician had published an article in the American Magazine for December in which he expressed his high appreciation of Greek study. I must confess that the news left me as cold as when Victor Hugo announced his belief in God, especially as I suspected that Dr. OSLER's laudation of Greek had been coupled with his usual fling at the poor brothers of the guild to which I belong (A. J. P. XXX 108). But the grammarians were spared this time and I tried to be grateful for being told that 'Man's redemption of man is the great triumph of Greek thought' and that 'The tap-root of modern science sinks deep in Greek soil, the astonishing fertility of which is one of the outstanding facts of history'. Nay, I was grateful because these fine sentences carried me back to my hot youth when I was in the missionary field and preached the doctrine of the Necessity of the Classics.

But I am out of that business and sometime ago when I had a fine opportunity to laud and magnify Greek and Greek studies, I deliberately renounced the attempt (Hellas and Hesperia, p. 20), for he who has heard with the spiritual ear the bright clear note of the Greek flute does not care for those who try to repeat it, whether on penny whistle or ophicleide, nay, hardly listens to the silver trumpet of Renan, who says in his *Peuple d'Israël*:

La Grèce seule découvrit la stabilité des lois de la nature. La Grèce découvrit le secret du beau et du vrai, la règle, l'idéal. Désormais il n'y aura plus qu' à se mettre à l'école; c'est ce que Rome fera, c'est ce que après chaque recrudescence de la barbarie feront les auteurs des renaissances sans fin.

However, Dr. OSLER's Redemption of Man is not so much a laudation of Greek as a deification of the writer's own profession. Now I have all respect for the *χρυσὴ ἐπη* of the successors of Demokedes' and Demokedes' valei, and in the matter of deification I am of the mind of the Lacedaemonians who said, 'Since Alexander wishes to be a god, let him be a god'. Yet I was somewhat startled by one of Dr. OSLER's proof-texts, startled by what he calls 'the memorable phrase of Prodicus', 'That which benefits human life is God'. Now every grammarian has a warm place in such heart as he has for Prodicus, the arch-synonymmonger, the fellow-islander of Simonides and Bakchylides, Prodicus of Keos, the only spot in Greek territory where suicide was fashionable, and so the right abode for the grammarian. Any phrase of his is worth remembering. But this memorable phrase is not to be found in Philodemus, our oldest witness, nor in Cicero, our most convenient witness, nor in Sextus Empiricus—all cited in Diels's *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 'Quid?' says Cicero, who follows Philodemus (N. D. I, 42, 118), 'Prodicus Cius, qui ea, quae prodesse hominum vitae, deorum in numero *habita esse* dixit, quam tandem religionem reliquit?' An echo of this sentiment is ascribed to one Persaeus (l. c., 15, 38) 'eos dicit *esse habitos* deos, a quibus magna utilitas ad vitae cultum esset inventa, ipsasque res utiles et salutares deorum esse vocabulis nuncupatas'. 'Habita esse'—'esse habitos'. Poor Prodicus's shallow theory as to the origin of the gods is bad enough without making him responsible for the sentiment 'That which benefits human life is God'. 'I think nobly of the <gods> and no way approve his opinion' says substantially Malvolio-Cicero; and 'the memorable phrase of Prodicus' is not the phrase of Prodicus but the phrase of that gay master of winged words, GUILLAUME L'OISELEUR dit OSLER.

For the public to which the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY—or, as a friend has dubbed it, the American Journal of Mephistophily—addresses itself, the allusion to Demokedes is not a recondite allusion. But in this age of ours the allusive style is pronounced the worst of all styles, and, in point of fact, it has been called the chief representative of 'le genre ennuyeux'—another recondite allusion, I suppose. On the same principle, Matthew Arnold has been taken to task for his frequent use of Scriptural language, which will soon be put in the category of recondite allusions. To an old-fashioned man like myself it seems perfectly justifiable to make any allusion whatever, so long as the surface sense is plain enough (A. J. P. XXXI 487). But, of course, every now and then when I think I am on safe ground I transgress my own law, as I did some years ago when, writing for the Atlantic Monthly, I alluded to the coat-of-arms of Massa-

chusetts, with its motto 'Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem'. 'The brandished sword', I wrote, 'would have shown what manner of *placida quies* SHE would have ensued if demands had been made on Massachusetts at all commensurate with the Federal demands on Virginia'. The little word 'she' was omitted and the sentence spoiled. But in my old age I 'seek peace and ensue it' (i Pet. 3, 11). However, as I have mentioned Demokedes, I may as well make an exception to my usual tirade against translations. I have in my time derived so much pleasure from Lange's translation of Herodotos into the racy language of Luther's Bible that I made sundry experiments in the same line, and the old French translations of Greek authors have a charm of their own. So I dip every now and then into Pierre Saliat's version of Herodotos (1556). It is not Amyot, but it is not bad. Unfortunately Saliat's rendering of the passage under consideration (Hdt. 3, 130) is singularly, in fact inexplicably, incorrect, and it is a pity that M. Eugène Talbot when he revived Saliat in his edition of 1864 did not correct the translation, as he professed to do, instead of modernizing the spelling.

La cure faicte de tout point, Daire lui fit present de deux couples de chaines d'or, lesquelles recevant il dit: 'Entendez-vous, Sire, par ces cadenes, que la fortune d'esclave me redouble pour vous avoir gueri?' Le roi prit plaisir en la parole, et l'envoya vers ses femmes. Les eunuques qui le conduisoient dirent aux dames qu'il estoit celuy qui avoit rendu la vie au roi. Adonc chascune d'elles, pour sa caresse, lui donna un vase d'or avec l'estuy, present si bien fourni et si plantureux qu'un page, nommé Sciton, ramassa grande somme d'or en recueillant les dariques qui tomberent des vases en les secouant pour mieulx entasser et agencer les pieces.

The mention of Dr. OSLER recalls our divergent estimates of Eryximachos (A. J. P. XXX 109) and Eryximachos recalls the famous sentence of the man in Athenaeus xv 666 A: *εἰ μὴ ἱατροὶ ἦσαν, οὐδὲν ἂν ἦν γραμματικῶν μωρότερον*, for Eryximachos was both physician and grammarian in the old *γραμματικός* sense. Substitute for *γραμματικῶν* the kindred word *ἐτυμολογικῶν* and behold a fitting introduction to what one of my contributors has to say about Mr. GEORGE O. HOLBROOKE'S *Aryan World-Building*. The Knickerbocker Press, New York.

'It is impossible', says Dr. FRANKLIN EDGERTON, 'to treat seriously a book which holds to the old three-vowel system for Indo-European, "splitting" *a* into *a e o* in Greek, etc., knows no later authority than Curtius, and uses worse than Curtian methods of etymology from beginning to end. Except as a fund of philological humour, it is so much waste paper. Here is one sample (Introduction, p. 5): "Losing the sibilant, *sthā* becomes (*thā*), which the Sanskrit replaces, according to its regular rule (!), by *dhā*—*Dhā* hardens into *dā* (to bestow, give), the roots *dhā* and *dā* melting into each other in a remarkable way in the Teu-

tonic languages", etc., etc. In this truly 'remarkable way' all the words of the Indo-European languages could be arranged in one long, beautiful etymological line'.

And then Dr. EDGERTON goes on to lament the waste of so much good money, when so many impecunious young doctors cannot afford to have their dissertations printed—dissertations, alas! which the advance of science will surely leave behind. Dr. EDGERTON's lament reminds me of a similar ejaculation of my own (A. J. P. XIV 260) touching the magnificence of Mr. EUSTACE HAMILTON MILES's *Comparative Syntax of Latin and Greek*, appearing as it did 'clad in the sumptuous raiment of the Cambridge University Press, while Professor Fraccaroli has been hoping and praying for a publisher all these years, and hoping and praying in vain'. But Fraccaroli's Pindar was published at last (A. J. P. XV 501) and Eustace Miles became a great man at tennis.

The few survivors among the pioneers of statistical syntax have often occasion to recall Goethe's Magician's Prentice as they watch the decimal devilry of recent investigators and shudder at the inevitable swamping of the fair fields of literature by these arithmetical deposits. Once in this line of business, however,—the Germans call it 'Mache',—it is impossible to resist the fascination of the process, impossible also for a certain order of mind not to try to get something out of the figures. On the scientific side some of the most palpable blunders have been made in the manipulation of said figures (A. J. P. XXV 104) and scholars have actually forgotten that Iliad and Odyssey are not of the same length, and as one concerned chiefly with the aesthetic side of the study, I ask myself now as I have asked myself before: Is it possible, or if possible, is it desirable to acquire a sensitiveness that can distinguish such minute details as have been used to stratify the language of Thukydides, Xenophon, Plato? If there is no feeling, all these figures are valueless for art, however valuable for science. Now the study of rhythm seems to be going the way of syntax. In the old times we were told that the small number of γένη is due to the fact that the ear cannot readily discern subtle proportions of arsis and thesis so that we have only γένος ἴσον, γένος διπλάσιον, γένος ἡμιόλιον, and even the γένος ἡμιόλιον is unfamiliar to the modern. But the study of prose rhythm has taught us a much greater variety. We are not content with the simple rule that the prose-writer must avoid those rhythms that are familiar to every ear by reason of the large use of them in poetry and that one must have a special care not to begin nor to end a sentence with a well-known poetical lilt, a well-known poetical cadence. The rule is of a piece with the dancing master's instructions how to enter a room, how to leave it. Cicero, as a master of stylistic

deportment, laid down some simple rules that ought to have been heeded, but, bless me, how few read Cicero's Orator in the days of which I am thinking, the days when a leading Latin scholar in his eagerness for an example of *aequalis* with the genitive resorted to the dictionary, the great quarry of school-grammars, and recklessly rendered, with a false reference to boot, Cicero's 'Creticus et eius aequalis Paeon', 'Creticus and his contemporary Paeon'. But such things are impossible now. The revived study of the Greek rhetoricians has changed all that and for the last two decades the refining process has gone on with ever-increasing minuteness, a minuteness that seems to defy what a friend of mine would call 'aural retention'. The whole thing has become a matter of digits, not a matter of ear. Now I do not wish to be understood as undervaluing research into the mysteries of *prosa numerosa*, but the signs of the times point to the introduction of the subject into elementary grammars; nay, the thing has already been perpetrated with a certain flourish of trumpets, and the business of analysis, already overdone, has added a new burden to the taskwork of the unlucky novice. The boy is forced to analyze before he has anything to analyze. Many years ago, myself a syntactician, I laid down as one of my three rules for beginners, Minimum of Syntax and myself a searcher after the ῥθoς of rhythm (A. J. P. XVI 394), I protest against too much eurhythmmy for boys. But, as I have said, the fascination of the subject for the professional scholar is undoubted, and I was much interested in a recent article which made the cretic the dominant note in the Ciceronian clausula. (See Draheim, W. f. K. Ph. 5 Dez. 1910 and cf. A. J. P. XXIX 372). But what space is there in *Brief Mention* for an adequate notice of ZANDER's *Eurhythmia vel Compositio Rhythmica Prosae Antiquae*, the first part of which contains in nearly five hundred pages the *Eurhythmia Demosthenis*—with the record of his *initia* and his *clausulae* (Leipzig, Harrassowitz). But to pass it by in silence would seem to be a sin if there were not so many ὄργια Μουσῶν at which the Journal must needs be mute.

Mr. STARKIE has a perfect right to amuse himself by his Shakespearian rendering of the *Acharnians*. One can never read the Elizabethan poets without recognizing the fact that the English language was at its richest then and if one desires to translate the lyric range of Greek poetry with its magnificent compounds, one must resort to the treasure-house of that opulent period (A. J. P. XXIII 467-9). No wonder that Professor Wood in writing of Beddoes (A. J. P. IV 445 fol.) gave his article the subtitle 'A Survival in Style', though with Beddoes the German influence must count, which to-day, in my judgment at least, is a sinister influence. The compounds that infest our scientific

journals, slavishly built as they are on German lines, have no organic unity. The terms of the surrender we made to our French masters centuries ago must be kept. 'Standpoint' is an abomination, 'viewpoint' is no better. But it is a sheer delight to see how Elizabethan English meets the conditions of higher Greek poetry and those who felt the charm of Greek compounds as is shewn in the well-known verses of Daniel, 'the learned Greek, rich in fit epithets, Blest in the lovely marriage of pure words' knew how to build them. But when we read Aristophanes we are not reading Lykophron nor studying Festus. Aristophanes is not a collection of glossematic Greek any more than Shakespeare is a collection of glossematic English. How many words has one to look up in a page of Shakespeare? The dreary business of statistics might help us here. At all events it is a violation of artistic law to render a word that is as familiar to a Grecian as the average of Shakespeare is to one born to the English tongue by some obsolete word that has to be fished up out of a glossary. The protest, I believe, has been made already, but such protests cannot be made too often. One I made myself years ago à propos of Conington's Persius, another à propos of Bevan's Prometheus (A. J. P. XXIII 467). 'Εφόδια is not 'sizes' or 'exhibition' nor ταῖσι 'pajocks', nor ἀλαζονεύμασιν 'rope-tricks', nor φαγεῖν τε καὶ πλεῖν 'guzzling and potting', nor ἐξαπατώμεθα 'colted'. *Neavias* is not a 'rakehell' as Starkie renders it in v. 525, nor a 'princox' as he renders it in v. 685. *Neavias* has some color, as we can see from Plato, but not so much as Starkie gives it. 'Springald' is a fine old word. Why not translate *neavias* 'springald'? *καταρπίοντες* is translated 'a stream in spate'. 'Spate' is a good word, but it is a manner of English Doric and may be sent to keep company with Mr. Bevan's 'fleech' for *προσεύχου* (A. J. P. XXIII 469). The fact is, this blend of twentieth century slang and Elizabethan English reminds one too much of Bismarck's favorite beverage of champagne laced with beer.

When a generation ago I accepted the invitation of my friend, Professor MARCH, to take part in the preparation of the ill-judged and ill-fated Douglass Series (A. J. P. XXV 484), the world of patristic was all before me where to choose and I lingered long over the pages of John Chrysostom. However, it was against my principles to edit any part of an author without making myself acquainted with the bulk of his authorship and the works of Chrysostom proved to be too voluminous, but I used to refresh myself after the aridities of Justin's Dialogue with Tryphon by a dip in Chrysostom and in the Cappadocian Fathers, who had a special attraction for me, partly perhaps because like Pindar and others they belonged to a maligned territory—*τοῖς ἡσσοσιν γὰρ πᾶς τις εὐνοίας φέρεται* (Essays and Studies, p. 355, Pindar, I. E. viii).

French writers of elementary manuals have not hesitated to draw upon the Fathers of the Church for examples of Greek Syntax and so I did not hesitate to utilize my patristic studies by getting up exercises based on Chrysostom. For those who desire to know more of that interesting period Chrysostom furnishes a rich quarry, haunted, it is true, but not exhausted, and some years ago Professor GELZER, of Jena, a specialist in Byzantine history, was happily inspired to set one of his American doctorands, Professor J. MILTON VANCE of Wooster, Ohio, the task of building up a *Byzantinische Culturgeschichte* out of the works of Chrysostom. Professor GELZER is dead and the Rev. Professor VANCE's dissertation is not in the trade, but he whose business it is to find subjects for doctoral dissertations will appreciate the relief to the teacher, the training for the student, the value of the compilation, and the immunity from qualified criticism, for few there be who know Chrysostom as Professor VANCE has learned to know him.

When we Americans indulge our national vein of mockery we are apt to fare ill at the hands of German critics unfamiliar with American conditions. In a review of Professor MORGAN's *Addresses and Essays* (A. J. P. XXXI 243) a critic in the *Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie* (6 Juni 1910) takes the first paper on Persius seriously and so fails to understand MORGAN's elaborate persiflage of the way in which certain scholars attempt to reverse traditional judgments. <Eine Studie,> he says, <die> mit wenig glücklichen Ausfällen gegen die 'Blindheit der Kommentatoren' und auf Grund von zum Teil recht wunderlichen Textinterpretationen, einen Wüstling übelster Art erkennen lassen will'. Even English scholars, who are more familiar with American ways, are puzzled by our ironies and in commenting on MORGAN's book Mr. ROUSE in the number of the *Classical Review* for December, 1910, says: 'As for Persius Mr. MORGAN quite took in the present writer, who began to be indignant and to prepare an answer before he suddenly perceived that he was the victim of a hoax, or should I say a haze?' This would have rejoiced the heart of Professor MORGAN, who in this respect was an American of the Americans. My own misadventures in this line are too numerous to record.

In his interesting *Notice sur la vie et les travaux de Henri Weil* M. GEORGES PERROT records the devotion of the great Hellenist to the memory of his master and mine, if I dare say so, August Boeckh. I shall never forget how the face of the aged scholar lighted up when he spoke of the large portrait which Boeckh had presented to him and how he repeated to me with

slow emphasis the verse which the giver had inscribed under the likeness: καλὸν τὸ θησαύρισμα κειμένη χάρις. It is a rather prosaic line after all, and the version of Grotius makes it still more prosaic: Benefacta bene locata, thesaurus gravis. But the reflection on the 'fine investment' was quite in the vein of the author of the Staatshaushaltung. It is a verse of Menander's, as M. PERROT reminds us, at any rate a Menandrean verse, but it must not be sought in Kock, for Kock has bundled all the γνώμαι μονόστιχοι out of doors. Perhaps he did not like that other verse (A. J. P. XX 108): ἀγαθὸν μέγιστον ἢ φρόνησις ἐστ' αἰεί. Another teacher whom Weil and I had in common was Welcker. 'Personne', says M. PERROT, 'selon Weil, n' a eu, au même degré que Welcker, le sentiment et comme l'intuition de la haute antiquité'. Some years ago, recalling my various German teachers, I wrote: 'From Welcker's lectures on Greek art the world of classic beauty rose before me like an exhalation, perhaps rather too much like an exhalation. Still it was a golden mist'. And I was interested to find that Weil carried away the same impression, better equipped though he was than I. The reason is given by M. PERROT, himself an archaeologist of renown: 'C'est que Welcker ne disposait point d'une galerie de moulages et sans cette aide, sans un constant appel à des monuments mis sous les yeux des auditeurs, un cours d'histoire de l'art, quelque talent qu'y apporte le maître, ne laissera jamais dans l'esprit de ceux qui l'écoutent que des idées bien vagues'. Still much can be learned from the camera. Only there was no camera then. But on one small point of history I must set M. PERROT right. There was a fair collection of plaster casts at the University of Bonn long before the death of Welcker (December 17, 1868). I myself followed with lively interest the demonstrations of Johannes Overbeck, then at the beginning of his long career, and in the Index Lectionum for the summer of 1853 I read: Gypsothecae monumenta illustrabit bis p. h. h. p. 1 Ioannes Overbeck.

In ZACHER's posthumous edition of the *Peace of Aristophanes* I find a reference to an article of his in Jhrb. 1887, p. 536, in which he comments on v. 241, a notorious verse, which has been discussed repeatedly in the Journal XI 372, XXI 231, XXVII 230, 486. It runs thus:

ὁ δεινός, ὁ ταλαύριμος, ὁ κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν.

Whereupon Zacher remarks with a genuine Aristophanic laugh (v. 335) that the last designation would not have racked the brains of the commentators so much, if they had read besides the text the scholia and the remarks in Dindorf and Dübner, where we have δεινός' συμβολικὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποπηδώντων. (For ἀποπηδώντων

read with Schol. V. ἀποτιλώντων. Rutherford suggests ἀποπατούντων accepted by Sharpley.) This, I have frankly admitted, makes an effective παρά προσδοκίαν close to the verse, and gives the prosaic side of war in contrast to the poetical side ὁ δεινός, ὁ ταλαύρινος. But, as everyone knows the scholiasts are always sniffing out bad smells, so that if the thing were printable, I should like to reproduce my Rabelaisian scholia on the part of Klytimestra in the Agamemnon, which I prepared some years ago as a protest against these malodorous discoveries, which are due in good measure to the morbid fancy of recluses, ancient and modern. Ancient and modern, for the moderns are no whit behind the ancients. Comp. v. 163 where σίτων, Porson's simple and natural correction for the unmetrical σιτίων has as its rivals Bentley's σκατίων and Von Velsen's πρωκτών. Mazon, it is true, expresses his regret that the much-lauded description of the charms of country life (v. 556 sqq.) is spoiled by the scholiast's *doubles ententes*, though he has to admit that almost all the products of the vegetable kingdom (A. J. P. XXII 470) mentioned in the passage are well-known equivalents of what Rutherford modestly called the *aedoea* (A. J. P. XIX 347). This being the case, I cannot hope to stem the current of scholiasts and critics; and I mention the matter simply to record another instance of the fatality that awaits too eager faultfinders (A. J. P. III 228, footn., XX 110-11). ZACHER was so busy with his criticism of the commentators on the Peace that he misquoted the passage and wrote τοῖν ποδοῖν, and I was so busy transfixing HEADLAM (A. J. P. XXXI 493, l. 43) that I overlooked the misprint οὐθ' ἐπιλείβων for οὐτ' ἐ. Misprint it was and not a contamination of οὐθ' ὑπολείβων and Schütz's οὐτ' ἐπιλείβων, as a good-natured friend suggests. Misprint it was, due to the tendency of typesetters and typewriters to uniformitarianism, but the charge of ablepsy abides as is the case with 'Chapman' for 'Chapman's', p. 489, l. 26, and p. 490, l. 22, 'comment' for 'commend'.

W. P. M.: Dr. ROBERT T. KERLIN's *Theocritus in English Literature* (Lynchburg, Va., 1910) is a thoroughgoing study of all that the title implies. It begins with John Skelton's mention of "Theocritus with his bucolycall relacyons" (1523) and it gives a very careful list of translations, paraphrases, imitations (direct and indirect), quotations, and allusions, down to our own day. Even reviews are sometimes quoted, for, as the author cautiously observes, "these, in the main, exhibit on the part of the writer a knowledge of the text and an appreciation of the poetry of the Idylls". And, finally, there is a very useful list of classified bibliographies. Some of the allusions and quotations are not very important: for example, Robert Greene's two

quotations (p. 36), which no one has ever been able to find. And a good many of the "tributes" and appreciations come from people who have no very obvious right to speak in praise of Theocritus, or of any other Greek poet. But the great names also are there—Spenser, Ben Jonson, Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and the rest—and the monograph should be of great interest both to the student of English and to the student of Greek. On p. 11 Dr. KERLIN was in doubt whether the French pastoralists knew, or cared much for, Theocritus—a doubt which may have since been removed by an article in this Journal, XXX 245-274. On p. 13 he might have added an early mention of "famous Theocrite" from the Prologue to the Eglogues of Alexander Barclay (c. 1514). On p. 17 he seems to give undue prominence to what 'E. K.' says about the influence of Theocritus upon Spenser; some of E. K.'s statements are not very important, and some of them are not true. His remark, for example, that the name Phyllis "is usual in Theocritus" is neither important nor true. The poem to which he saw a resemblance in Spenser's March Eclogue is now ascribed, not to Theocritus, but to Bion. His statement that the October Eclogue is "made in imitation of Theocritus his xvi. Idillion" is distinctly misleading, and it must have been meant to be misleading. To be sure, he added—what most of his readers were likely to know—"and the lyke also is in Mantuane"; but it would doubtless be more impressive to refer a poem to a great Greek model than to the "homely Carmelite" whose Eclogues were a familiar text-book in almost every school. On p. 19 it might have been added that Spenser's November Eclogue, 43-46, is a very distinct echo—doubtless through Clément Marot—of Id. i, 23-25. On p. 95 the passage in Shelley's Adonais about the mourning Dreams owes much less to Theocritus than it does to the passage about the weeping Loves in Bion's Lament for Adonis. On p. 121 the "Theocritean" tone of the lines about Proserpina in Matthew Arnold's Thyrsis might better be explained by the passage of Moschus (Lament for Bion, 121-122) to which Arnold was doing his best to allude. On p. 184 Sidgwick's Virgil is set down as the most valuable edition for the student of Theocritus because of its "full list of parallel passages"—a list which Sidgwick expressly says is borrowed "from Ribbeck". On p. 142 it is hardly kind to our older teachers of Greek to say that "doubtless the chief means of making our poet known in America" was the prose translation by Mr. Andrew Lang. And on p. 159 it is at least premature to count Professor Gilbert Murray, of Oxford, as an American scholar. On p. 141 we are told that "in American papers and magazines the name of Theocritus is not to be found until within the last decade". But the Atlantic Monthly had a rather famous article on "Tennyson and Theocritus", by E. C. Stedman, in 1871.

SAMUEL HENRY BUTCHER,

APRIL 16, 1850—DECEMBER 29, 1910.

Thirty-one years ago I made for the first time the personal acquaintance of some of the lights of English classical scholarship. Of those whom I learned to know best, Jebb and Monro have been withdrawn from our firmament and now Butcher, the radiant, is gone. Butcher, many years my junior, was then in the first flush of achievement. My heart went out to the young scholar. Whose heart was ever closed to him? Our paths in life crossed more than once after that. Every point of meeting was for me an illumination. Every letter, every note was full of light. I can never read the First Pythian of Pindar without recalling the long letter he wrote me from Taormina. Taking up Verrall's Choephoroi the other day, I found the margin flecked with notes of the *curta supellex* order. *Curta supellex* is a better title for my *marginalia* than *Brief Mention*. But as I was about to transfer these notes to my collection of such trifles, my eye lighted upon Verrall's dedication of the book to Butcher. I dropped my pen and resumed it but to copy these words, 'No one will read the book with a more vigilant care for the poet or a kinder consideration for the editor'. Quite apart from the close personal relations of the two distinguished scholars, these words convey a great moral lesson, one that I might have taken to heart in my long series of animadversions on the work of better men. Vigilant care for the original, kind consideration for the interpreter—this is the spirit in which we ought all to work; a spirit of which Butcher was a shining example. For an estimate of what he achieved this is not the place. Some of his work I have characterized elsewhere. But it is the place for the expression of the grief that many feel on this side of the Atlantic, as on that, for the untimely passing of one who made life so much better worth living.

ἐκεῖνος ὅσα χάσματα ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν,
τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναιτο;

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Aristotle. The works of; tr. into English under the editorship of J. A. Smith and W. D. Ross. Vol. II. *De generatione animalium*, by Arth. Platt. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1910. Various paging. 8°, pap., \$2.50.

Bars (J. E.) Writing Latin. Bk. 1.; rev. ed. Boston, *Heath*, 1910. 144 pp. 12°, cl., 50 c. net.

Bennett (C. E.) Syntax of Early Latin. Vol. I. The Verb. Boston, *Allyn & Bro.*, 1910 [1911]. 526 pp. 8°, \$4.

Caesar's Gallic war; books I-II and selections from V-VII; with introd., notes, and vocab., by J. C. Rolfe and A. W. Roberts. New York, *Scribner* 1910. 16+97+343+100 pp. Il. map. 12°, \$1.25.

Ciceronis (M. T.) *De officiis libri tres*; by E. P. Crowell. 3d rev. ed. New York, *Hinds*, 1910. 6+7-347 pp. 16°, \$1.10.

Griggs (E. H.) The philosophy of Plato and its relation to modern life; New York, *Huebsch*, 1911. 50 pp. 12°, pap., 25 c.

Jenner (W. A.) and Willson (H. E.) Caesar's first campaign; a beginner's Latin book. New York, *Appleton*, 1910. 3-18+313 pp. Il. 12°, \$1 net.

Keller (A. G.) Homeric society; a sociological study of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. New York, *Longmans*, 1911. 8+332 pp. 12°, \$1.20.

Pater (Wa.) Works. In 10 Vol. Vol. VIII. Greek studies. New York, *Macmillan*, 1910. 298; 7+161; 261 pp. 8°, cl., \$2 net.

Plutarch on education. Ed. by C. W. Super. Syracuse, N. Y., *C. W. Bardeen*, 1910. 102 pp. 12°, \$1.

Plutarch's Cimon and Pericles, with the funeral oration of Pericles; newly tr., with introd. and notes, by B. Perrin. New York, *Scribner*, 1910. 11+287 pp. Front. 8°, cl., \$2 net.

Sihler (E. G.) Annals of Caesar; a critical biography. New York, *Stechert*, 1911 [1910]. 9+330 pp. 8°, cl., \$1.75 net.

Smith (W. W.) A course in first year Latin. New York, *W. R. Jenkins Co.*, 1910. 8+365 pp. 12°, \$1.

Taciti, Cornelii, *historiarum libri*. *Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit* C. D. Fischer. (viii, 262 S.) 8°. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1911. 3s. 6d.

Tacitus' histories; bks. 1 and 2; ed. by F. G. Moore. New York, *Macmillan*, 1910. 8+249 pp. 16°, cl., 60 c. net.

Terenti (P. Afri). *Havton timorvmenos*; ed. with introd. and notes, by F. G. Ballentine. Boston, *B. H. Sanborn*, 1910. 21+129 pp. 12°, \$1.

Thucydides. History of the Peloponnesian war; done into English by R. Crawley; with 5 maps. New York, *Dutton*, 1910. 16+614 pp. 16° (Everyman's lib.), cl., 35 c. net; leath., 70 c. net.

Woodhouse (S. C.) *English-Greek Dictionary*. London, 1910. 1038 pp. 8°, 15s. net.

Xenophontis opera omnia; ed. E. C. Marchant. 4 Vol. Vol. I, *Historia Graeca*; Vol. II, *Libri Socratici*; Vol. III, *Anabasis*; Vol. IV, *Institutio Cyri*. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1910. 8° (Oxford classical texts), Vol. I, 75 c.; Vol. II, 90 c.; Vol. III, 75 c.; Vol. IV, cl., 90 c.; pap., 75 c.

— *Anabasis*. Bks. 1-4; ed., with introd., notes and vocab., by M. W. Mather and Jos. W. Hewitt. New York, *American Book Company*, 1910. 516 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.50.

FRENCH.

Aymès (Noël). *Hellas, la Grèce antique*. Paris, 1910. 16°, 3 fr. 50 c.

Duquesne (J.) *La translatio iudicii dans la procédure civile romaine*, in-8°. *Larose et Tenin*. 7 fr.

Nestorius. *Le livre d'Heraclide de Damas*, traduit par F. Nau, avec le texte grec des trois homélies en trois appendices (xxviii-402 pp.), in-8°. *Letouzey et Ané*. 10 fr.

Papillon (J.) *Traduction en vers des églogues de Virgile*, 22×14. *G. Ficker*. 2 fr. 50.

Reinach (Salomon). *Répertoire de la statuaire grecque et romaine*. T. IV, 4.000 grav., in-12. *E. Lerouz*. 5 fr.

GERMAN.

Catullus (Valerius). In deutscher Übertragung nebst Erläuterungen v. M. Schuster. 2. Aufl. (xi, 276 S.) 8°. M. Ostrau, *R. Papauschek*; Wien, *R. Lechner & Sohn*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 4.20.

Ciceronis, M. Tulli, ad M. Brutum et M. Brutum ad M. Tullium Ciceronem epistularum liber nonus. Rec. H. Sjögren. (vii, 608.) gr. 8°. Upsaliae, 1910. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*. nn. 1.75.

Erbe, das, der Alten. Gesammelt u. hrsg. v. O. Crusius, O. Immisch, Th. Zielinski. Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich*. 1. Heft. *Treu (Geo.)* Hellenische Stimmungen in der Bildhauerei v. einst u. jetzt. 1. u. 2. Aufl. (xi, 52 S. m. 62 Abbildgn. u. 1 Taf.) 1910. 1.80; geb. 2.50; in Perg. 5.

Forschungen zur griechischen u. lateinischen Grammatik, hrsg. v. Paul Kretschmer, Frz. Skutsch, Jac. Wackernagel. gr. 8°. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. 1. Heft. *Lautensach (O.)* Die Aoriste bei den attischen Tragikern u. Komikern. (iv, 309 S.) 1911. 10 m.

Franchi de' Cavalleri (Pius). u. Iohs. Lietzmann: *Specimina codicum graecorum vaticanorum*. (50 Taf. m. XVI S. Text.) Lex. 8°. Bonnae, 1910. Bonn, *A. Marcus & E. Weber*. geb. in Leinw. 6; Vorzugsausg. b 12.

Gudeman (Alfr.) *Imagines philologorum*. 160 Bildnisse aus der Zeit von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart. (40 S. Abbildgn. m. VIII S. text.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 3.20; geb. 4.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrsg. von Dr. Iwan v. Müller. Lex. 8°. München, *C. H. Beck*. IX. Bd. 2. Abtlg. 1. Tl. *Manitius (Max.)* Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters. I. Tl. Von Justinian bis zur Mitte des 10. Jahrh. Mit Index. (xiii, 766 S.) 1911. 15; geb. in Halbfrz. n 17.50.

Harder (Christian). *Schulwörterbuch zu Homers Illas u. Odyssee*. 2. verb. Aufl. (xxiii, 281 S. m. 97 Abbildgn. u. 2 farb. Karten.) gr. 8°. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 4.

Hesiod's Werke, übers. v. J. H. Voss. Neu hrsg. durch Bertha Kern-v. Hartmann. (vii, 244 S.) 8°. Tübingen, *J. C. B. Mohr*, 1911. geb. in Pappbd. 3; in Halbperg. 4.50.

Horatius Flaccus, des Q., sämtliche Werke. 1. Tl. Oden u. Epoden. Erklärt v. C. W. Nauck. 17. Aufl. v. P. Hoppe. (xxvi, 227 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1910. 2.40; geb. in Leinw. 2.80.

Koch (Loth.) Xenophonsätze zur Einübung der griechischen Syntax in Tertia u. Secunda. 2. verb. Aufl. (vii, 93 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1910. 1.60.

Luciani quae fertur Demosthenis laudatio. Recensuit et illustravit Albers. (v, 76 S.) gr. 8°. Lipsiae, 1910. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 2.80; geb. 4.

Lukian's v. Samosata sämtliche Werke. Aus dem Griech. v. M. Weber. 1. Bd. (xv, 194 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *Verlag f. Literatur, Kunst u. Musik*, 1910. 3.

Münzen, die antiken, Nord-Griechenlands, unter Leitung von F. Imhoof-Blumer herausgegeben von der königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften. I. Bd. 2. Tl. Die antiken Münzen von Dacien und Moesien. Von B. Pick und Kurt Regling. II. Halbbd. 1. Abt. Die Münzen von Odessos und Tomis. Berlin, 1910. 8°. IV u. p. 519-920. Mit 1 Ergänzungstaf. S. 1906 Nr. 3391. 40 m.

Persii Flacci (A.) Saturarum liber. Iterum recensuit, adnotatione critica instruxit, testimonia usque ad saeculum XV addidit Santi Consoli. (xx, 190 S.) gr. 8°. Romae, *Loescher & Co.*, 1911. 4.

Petersen (Walt.) Greek diminutives in -iov. A study in semantics. (vii, 299 S.) gr. 8°. Weimar, *R. Wagner Sohn*, 1910. b 12.

Petronius' Satiren. Nach dem Text v. Frz. Bücheler verdeutschte durch e. homo Heidelbergensis. (160 S.) 8°. Heidelberg, *O. Petters*, 1910. b 7.50; geb. in Ldr. 10.

Platon. Auswahl: Protagoras (verkürzt), Laches, Menon u. Abschnitte aus dem Gorgias u. dem Euthydemus. Für den Schulgeb. hrg. v. Herm. Röhl. 1. Tl. Text. (216 S.) 8°. Münster, *Aschendorff*, 1910. geb. 1.50.

— Protagoras. Für den Schulgeb. hrg. v. A. Th. Christ. (107 S.) 8°. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1910. geb. 1.

Plutarch's ausgewählte Biographien. Für den Schulgebrauch bearb. v. Paul Verres. 1. Bdchn.: Demosthenes u. Cicero. II. Kommentar. (72 S.) kl. 8°. Münster, *Aschendorff*, 1910. 75.

Schirmer (Karl). Bilder aus dem altrömischen Leben. (viii, 148 S. m. 30 Abbildgn.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 2.50.

Schramm (E.) Griechisch-römische Geschütze. (37 S. m. Abbildgn. u. 10 farb. Taf.) gr. 8°. Metz, *G. Scriba*, 1910. geb. in Halbleinw. 3.

Schwahn (Wth.) Geschichte der Griechen und Römer im Altertum. Berlin, 1910. 8°. IV, 410 pp. Mit 20 Taf. 20 m.

Skerlo (H.) Ueber den Gebrauch von *ἐνι* bei Homer. (71 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock*, 1910. 2.

Sophokles, des, Tragödien. Deutsch v. H. Schnabel. 2 Bde. (v, 497 S. m. Bildnis.) 8°. Leipzig, *Dr. W. Klinkhardt*, 1910. je 3; in 1 Leinw. Bd. geb. 7.

Steele (R. B.) Conditional Statements in Livy. Leipzig, 1910. 8°. 61 pp. 2 m.

Stowasser (J. M.) Griechenlyrik. Römerlyrik. In deutsche Verse übertr. 4-8 Taus. 2 Bde. (xxiii, 287 u. xx, 492 S.) 8°. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1910. geb. 5.

Tragoedien, griechische. Übers. von Ulr. v. Willamowitz-Moellendorf. III. Bd. Euripides: Der Kyklop; Alkestis; Medea; Troerinnen. 3. Aufl. (363 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1910. geb. in Leinw. 6.

— dasselbe. Einzelausgaben. 1. Heft. Sophokles: Oedipus. 7. Aufl. (88 S.) 8°. Ebd., 1910. geb. in Leinw. 1.

Traube (L.) Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen. Herausg. von Fr. Boll. 2. Bd. Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters. Herausg. von P. Lehmann. München, 1910. 8°. IX, 176 pp. S. 1909 Nr. 285. 8 m.

Viedebantt (Osc.) Quaestiones Epiphanianae metrologicae et criticae. (x, 140 S. m. 6 Taf.) gr. 8°. Lipsiae, 1911. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 6.

Wohlrab (Mart.) Die altklassischen Reallen im Gymnasium. 8. Aufl. (viii, 104 S. m. 2 farb. Plänen.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. geb. 1.20.

Zander (C.) Eurythmia vel compositio rhythmica prosae antiquae exposuit Z. I. Eurythmia Demosthenis. Leipzig, 1910. 8°. XX, 494 pp. 8 m.

ITALIAN.

Porzio (G.) Atene, Corinto, Pericle e le cause della guerra Peloponnesiaca. Bologna, 1910. 8°. L. 4.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Arrian's Anabasis in Auswahl von Georg Heidreich. I. Teil. Einleitung u. Text. II. Teil. Erklärende Anmerkungen u. Wörterbuch. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. 1 m. 75 pf.

'Αθηνά. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν 'Αθήναις 'Επιστημονικῆς 'Εταιρείας. Τόμος κβ', τεῦχος γ' καὶ δ'. 'Αθήνησιν, 1910.

Barbagallo (Corrado). Lo Stato e l'Istruzione Pubblica nell' Impero Romano. Catania, *Francesco Battiano*, 1911.

Bennett (C. E.) Syntax of Early Latin. Vol. I. The Verb. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1911.

Berliner Texte. Herausg. von der Generalverwaltung der Kgl. Museen zu Berlin., Heft VI. Altchristliche Texte. Bearbeitet von C. Schmidt u. W. Schubart. Mit 2 Lichtdrucktafeln. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1910. 10 m.

Brown (F. C.) Elkanah Settle. His Life and Works. Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*, 1910. \$1.25.

Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin No. 37. Gerard Fowke: Antiquities of Central and Southern Missouri. No. 45. Frances Densmore: Chippea Music. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., *Government Printing Office*.

Butler (Isabel). Tales from the Old French. Boston, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*, 1910. \$1.25.

Ciceronis (M. T.) ad M. Brutum et M. Bruti ad M. Tullium Ciceronem Epistularum Liber Nonus. Recensuit H. Sjögren; Gotoburgi, Eranos' Förlag; Lipsiae, *O. Harrassowitz*, MDCCCX. 1 kr. 50 öre.

Collitz (Hermann). Zum Hildebrandslied. Separatabdruck aus: Paul, Sievers u. Braune's Beiträge XXXVI. Band. 2 Heft. Halle, *Niemeyer*, 1910.

— Review of Fick's Hattiden u. Danubier in Griechenland. Reprinted from Classical Philology, Vol. V, No. 4, October, 1910.

Classical Quarterly (The). October, 1910. London, *John Murray*, 1910.

Cook (Tennessee Claflin). The Need of Revising Morals and Laws. London, *Haymann, Christy & Lilly*.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Ed. consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis. Vol. XXVI. Tyranni Rufini Opera. Pars. I. Orationum Gregorii Nazianzeni Novem Interpretatio. Edidit Augustus Engelbrecht. Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, MDCCCX. 12 m. 56 pf.

Eastern and Western Review. November, 1910, and January, 1911. *Greek-American Publishing Co.*, Boston, Mass.

Ellis (Robinson). Adversaria VII. Journal of Philology, Vol. XXXI.

— Note on De Deo Socratis. Note on the Fragments of Callimachus. III, p. 123.

Essays on Modern Theology and Related Subjects. A Testimonial to Charles Augustus Briggs on the completion of his seventieth year. New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1911. \$2.50.

Fiske (G. C.) Lucilius and Persius. Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XL, 1910.

Gildersleeve (B. L.) and Miller (C. W. E.) Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes. Second Part, Embracing the Doctrine of the Article, Elaborated by Professor Miller. New York, American Book Co., 1911.

Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature. I. Santyana (George). Three Philosophical Poets, Lucretius, Dante and Goethe. Cambridge, Harvard University, 1910. \$2.25.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XXI, 1910. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Haupt (Paul). The Book of Micah. A New Metrical Translation with restoration of the Hebrew Text and Explanatory and Critical Notes. Reprinted from the American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1910.

Heidel (W. A.) The ἀναρμυοὶ ὄγκοι of Heraclides and Asclepiades. Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XL, 1910.

Hempl (George). The Solving of an Ancient Riddle. The Phaestos Disk. Reprint from Harper's Magazine, January, 1911.

Hermes. Herausg. v. E. Leo u. Carl Robert. XLV. Band. 4. Heft. XLVI. Band. 1. Heft. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1911.

Hodge (Frederick Webb). Handbook of American Indians. North of Mexico. In two Parts. Part 2. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology.) Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1910.

Humanistic Studies, The Value of. The Classics and the New Education. A Symposium from the Proceedings of the Classical Conference held at Ann Arbor, Michigan, March, 31, 1910. Reprinted from the School Review, September, October, November, 1910.

Lateinisches Lesebuch für Gymnasien von Karl Prinz. II. Teil. Erklärende Anmerkungen u. Wörterbuch. Wien, F. Tempsky. Leipzig, G. Freytag, 1911. 1 m. 50 pf.

Lehmann-Haupt (C. E.) Die historische Semiramis u. ihre Zeit. Mit 50 Abbildungen. Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1910. geb. 2 m.

Magoun (H. W.) Aryan Root Vowels. Three-eight and Other Analyses of Logaoedic Forms.

— Extracts from the Proceedings of the American Philological Association, Vol. XL, 1910. The Glacial Epoch and the Noachian Deluge. Cambridge, Mass. The Author: Address c/o Kirtland Sons, 1910. 25 c.

Manitius (Max). Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters. Erster Teil. Von Justinian bis zur Mitte des zehnten Jahrhunderts. Mit Index. (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausg. v. I. von Müller. Neunter Band. 2 Abt. 1 Teil.) München, C. H. Beck (Oscar Beck), 1911. 15 m.

Μελέτη ('H). Μηνιαῖον δημοσίευμα. Ὀκτ. Νοέμβ. Δεκ. 1910. ἐν Ἀθήναις. @ 1 δρ.

Merrill (Elmer Truesdell). On the Early Printed Editions of Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan. Classical Philology, Vol. V, No. 4, October, 1910.

Minucii (M. M. Felicis) Octavius. Con Introduzione e Commento di Luigi Valmaggi. Torino, Paravia e Comp., 1910. L. 1.60.

Mustard (W. P.) On the Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus. Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XL, 1910.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. Bernhard Gerth.

Dreizehnter Jahrg., 1910. XXV. u. XXXVI. Bandes 10 Heft. Vierzehnter Jahrg. XXVII. u. XXXIII. Bandes 1 Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1910-1911.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Nr. 5/6. Nr. 7/8. Helsingfors, 1910. Oriental Bibliography. Vol. XXII (for 1908). Third Part. Compiled and edited by Lucian Scherman. Berlin, *Reuther & Reinhard*, 1910. 12s. 6d. per ann.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). Ed. by Sir Jas. A. H. Murray. *Simple*, by W. A. Craigie. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*. 60 c.

Pascal (Carlo). Dioniso. Saggio sulla religione e la parodia religiosa in Aristofane. Biblioteca di Filologia Classica. Catania, *Francesco Battiano*, 1911. L. 5.

Perrot (Georges). Notice sur la vie et les travaux de Henri Weil. Institut de France. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Paris, *Firmin Didot*, MDCCCXC.

Petersen (Walter). Greek Diminutives in ION. A Study in Semantics. *Wilmor, R. Wagner Sohn*, 1910.

Platons Protagoras von A. Th. Christ. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911. 1 m.

Plutarch's Cimon and Pericles with the Funeral Oration of Pericles. Thuc. ii, 35-46. Newly translated with Introduction and Notes. By *Bernadotte Perrin*. New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1910. \$3.00.

Prammers Schulwörterbuch zu Caesars Bellum Gallicum. Bearbeitet von Anton Polaschek. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1911.

Putorli (N.) Lo Xiphias di Diego Vitrioli. Messina.

La Collezione di Vasi antichi del poeta Diego Vitrioli. Estratto da *Ausonia*, Anno IV, MCMIX. Fasc. II.

Reinhardt (Carolus). De Graecorum theologia Capita duo. Berolini, *Apud Weidmannos*, MCMX. 4 m.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Julio de 1910. Universidad de la Habana. Habana, *Avisador Comercial*, 1910.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von August Brinkmann. N. F. LXV. 4. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerländer's Verlag*, 1910.

Ridgeway (William). The Origin of Tragedy with special reference to the Greek Tragedies. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1910. \$2.25.

Robbins (F. E.) The relation between Codices B and F of Pliny's Letters. Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vol. V, No. 4, October, 1910.

Robinson (D. M.) A Panathenaic Amphora with the Archon's name Astelos.

— Greek and Latin Inscriptions at Sardis. *American Journal of Archaeology*, XIV, No. 4, 1910.

Rolfe (John C.) Verg. Aen. III 207 and Caesar, B. G. I, 18, 4-6. *Classical Journal*, Vol. VI, No. 2, November, 1910.

Samter (Ernst). Geburt, Hochzeit u. Tod. Beiträge zur vergleichenden Volkskunde. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1911. 6 m.

Schickinger (H.) Auswahl aus Plutarch. 2. Teil. Erklärende Anmerkungen. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. 1 m. 50.

Schirmer (Karl). Bilder aus dem altrömischen Leben. Ein Lesebuch für die oberen Klassen höherer Lehranstalten. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1910. 2 m. 50 pf.

Schulz (Hans). Deutsches Fremdwörterbuch. Erste Lieferung, A-Batterie. Strassburg, Karl J. Trübner, 1910. 1 m. 50 pf.

Scriptor Latinus. Annus VIII. Num. VI-VII. Editor, Hans Lüsteröder; Redactor, Voldemarus Lommatzsch, Bremerhaven, 1911.

Shorey (Paul). A Symposium on the Value of Humanistic, particularly Classical Studies: The Classics and the New Education. III. The Case for the Classics. School Review, November, 1910.

— Φύσις, Μελέτη, Ἐπιστήμη. Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XL, 1910.

Snell (A. L.) The Beginnings of Speech. A Treatise on the Uni-Radical Origin of Indo-European Words. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1910.

Stewart (J. F.) and Tilley (Arthur). The Romantic Movement in French Literature, Traced by a Series of Texts, Selected and Edited. Cambridge, At the University Press. New York, G. R. Putnam's Sons, 1910. \$1.25.

Terenti (P. T. Afri). Hauton Timorumenos. Edited with Introduction and Notes by F. G. Ballentine. Boston and New York, R. H. Sanborn & Co., 1910.

University of California Publications in Semitic Philology. Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 129-397, October, 1910: Contents—Abū'l-Mahāsīm Ibn Tagbrī and Birdī's Annals. Edited by William Popper. Berkeley, California, 1910.

Valentino (Roberto). Un Codice abbreviato di Valerio Massimo. Estratto dagli Studi italiani di Filologia Classica. Vol. XVIII. Firenze, R. Seeber, 1910.

Vance (J. M.) Beiträge zur Byzantinischen Kulturgeschichte am Ausgange des IV. Jahrh. Aus den Schriften des Johannes Chrysostomos (Jena Diss.). Jena, Neuehahn, 1907.

Wied (Karl). Praktisches Lehrbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache für den Schul- u. Selbstunterricht. Vierte Aufl. Wien u. Leipzig, A. Hartleben's Verlag, 1910. 2 k. 20 h.

Whitmore (Charles E.) On a Passage in Pindar's Fourth Nemean Ode. Printed from the Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXI, 1910.

Xenophon's Anabasis Books I-IV. Edited with an Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by M. W. Mather and J. W. Hewitt. New York, American Book Company, 1910.